NO80-630 ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 022 9-02-66 24
RESEARCH SEMINAR ON RACIAL AND OTHER ISSUES AFFECTING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN THE GREAT CITIES OF AMERICA.
USDAN, MICHAEL D.
PXM53750 NORTHWESTERN UNIV. EVANSTON, ILL.
CRP-G-028
- -66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$8.76 219P.

*SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, *URBAN SCHOOLS, *SEMINARS, *CURRENT EVENTS, *SOCIOECONOMIC INFLUENCES, RACE RELATIONS, EDUCATION CHANGES, EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, POPULATION TRENDS, UNEMPLOYMENT, URBAN RENEWAL, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, COLLEGE-HIGH SCHOOL COOPERATION, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

RACIAL STRIFE, POPULATION MOBILITY, CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT, URBAN DECAY, AND OTHER CURRENT ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES OF LARGE CITIES WERE DELINEATED IN A SEMINAR TO PROVIDE WORKABLE PROPOSALS, GREATER COMMUNICATION, AND UNDERSTANDING AMONG SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WHO MUST DEAL WITH THESE PROBLEMS IN THEIR DAY-BY-DAY OPERATIONS. AMONG THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE SEMINAR WERE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, REPRESENTATIVES FROM INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND MEMBERS FROM OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS. A TWO-DIMENSIONAL CLASSIFICATION SCHEME WAS DEVELOPED FOR ALL RESEARCH PROPOSALS. THE FIRST DIMENSION SIGNIFIED THE LEVELS WITHIN A SCHOOL ORGANIZATION WITH WHICH A PARTICULAR RESEARCH PROGRAM MIGHT DEAL (I.E., TECHNICAL, MANAGERIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL). THE SECOND SUMMARIZED THE CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT AS MEANS TO ORIENT AND DIRECT A RESEARCH PROGRAM. IT WAS NOTED THAT PARTICIPATING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TENDED TO EMPHASIZE DEVELOPMENTAL PROPOSALS AT A LOWER ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL THAN DID THE UNIVERSITY PEOPLE WHO MOST OFTEN PREFERRED RESEARCH PROPOSALS. BOTH GROUPS EXPRESSED INTEREST IN A VARIETY OF PROBLEMS, BUT DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH REMAINED LARGELY UNRESOLVED. THE MOST IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION OF THE SEMINAR WAS BELIEVED TO BE A FIRM REALIZATION OF THE NEED FOR INCREASED DIALOGUE AND COMMUNICATION BETWEEN RESEARCHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. (JH)

ED010022

RESEARCH SEMINAR ON RACIAL AND OTHER ISSUES AFFECTING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN THE GREAT CITIES OF AMERICA

Cooperative Research Project No. G-028

Michael D. Usdan
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons contributed to the Seminar. The key to the meeting's success, of course, was the active involvement and outstanding service rendered by the participants, whose names are listed on page ii. To these people and to their school systems, colleges, and universities, we express appreciation. The papers starting with Calvin Gross' keynote address and ending with David Clark's final presentation were of consistently high caliber and significant contributions. Appendix A contains the Seminar Program.

We are grateful for the support of Northwestern University through whose offices this Seminar was administered. Particular thanks are due to Dean B. J. Chandler of Northwestern's School of Education whose continuous support and guidance were instrumental in the Seminar's development and ultimate fruition.

The Great Cities Research Council had long been concerned with many of the issues to be discussed and its constituent cities were invited to send representatives to the Seminar. Particular gratitude must be expressed to the executive committee and member school systems of the Council for their interest in this Seminar.

Special thanks are due also to the members of the Planning Committee consisting of Frederick Bertolaet of the Great Cities Research Council, Luvern Cunningham of the University of Chicago, David Minar of Northwestern, and Harold S. Vincent of the Milwaukee Public Schools for their contributions in planning the program.

Finally, thanks must be given to Raphael Nystrand and Arthur Tebbutt for their assistance during the Seminar and their invaluable aid in preparing this report.

Michael D. Usdan
Director of the Seminar

PARTICIPANTS

Frederick Bertolaet	Executive Secretary, Great Cities Research Council
Norman Boyan	Associate Professor of Education, Stanford University
John Brandstetter	Director for Junior High Schools, Houston Independent School District
Warren Button	Associate Professor of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo
B. J. Chandler	Dean, School of Education, Northwestern University
David Clark	Professor of Education, Ohio State University
Clair H. Cogan	Associate Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools
Luvern Cunningham	Director, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago
William Cunningham	Assistant Superintendent, Boston School Department
Frank Dressler	Assistant Superintendent, Buffalo Public Schools
Clifford H. Evans	Assistant Superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools
M. Thomas Goedeke	Assistant Superintendent, Baltimore Public Schools
Calvin E. Gross	Dean, School of Education, University of Missouri at Kansas City
Harry Handler	Director, Research and Development Branch, Los Angeles Public Schools
H. Thomas James	Professor of Education, Stanford University
Carroll F. Johnson	Superintendent of Schools, White Plains Public Schools
Jessie Kennedy	Principal, Detroit Public Schools
Louis Kornhauser	Director, Great Cities Project, District of Columbia Public Schools
Richard McVey	Professor of Education, Roosevelt University
Curtis Melnick	District Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools
David Minar	Associate Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University
Arthur Rice	Project Coordinator-INSITE, School of Education, Indiana University
Harry E. Ritchie	Assistant Superintendent of Research and Development, Cleveland Public Schools
Harry N. Rivlin	Dean of Teacher Education, The City University of New York
Sam Shepard, Jr.	Assistant Superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools
Charles E. Stewart	Director of Teacher Education, Detroit Public Schools
Harold S. Vincent	Superintendent, Milwaukee Public Schools
George Watson	Formerly Wisconsin State Superintendent of Public Schools
Harold Webb	Executive Secretary, National School Boards Association
Harold L. Weeks	Director of Research, San Francisco Unified School District
Wesley A. Wildman	Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago
Richard Wynn	Professor of Education, University of Pittsburgh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE SEMINAR--BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES 1

Urgent Issues in the Big Cities: Implications for Administration

Calvin E. Gross 5

II. SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS 13

The Politics of Education in Large Cities: A Political Scientist's Viewpoint

David W. Minar 13

Educational Problems in the Large Cities of America: Board Members Perspectives

Harold Webb 28

The Politics of Educational Finance and Budgetary Decision-Making in Large City School Systems

H. Thomas James 38

A Superintendent Views the Racial Problems Confronting School Administrators

Carroll F. Johnson 49

Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators

Charles E. Stewart 60

The School-Community Relationship in Big Cities

Samuel Shepard, Jr. 78

The Inevitable Change in School Public Relations

Arthur H. Rice 87

The Reorganization of Large City School Districts--Implications of Decentralization for Administrators

B. J. Chandler 94

Large Cities--State Department Relationships: Problems and Prospects

G. E. Watson 100

CHAPTER PAGE

The Preparation of Large City School Administrators
Luvern L. Cunningham 113
Personnel Problems Confronting Large City School Administrators
Richard C. McVey 136
Teacher Collective Action in the U. S.: 1965
Wesley A. Wildman 152
III. RESEARCH OUTCOMES OF THE SEMINAR 170
Research Implications of the Seminar: A Review and Synthesis
David L. Clark 198
APPENDIX A
SEMINAR PROGRAM 211

CHAPTER I

THE SEMINAR--BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

THE PROBLEM

Recent developments have dramatized the educational, social, political, and economic crisis which currently exists in large cities all over the country. Unprecedented challenges confront the administrators of the nation's largest school districts. Rapidly changing social and economic conditions confront large city school superintendents with a host of serious problems. Racial strife, population mobility, chronic unemployment, urban decay, and other important developments have altered significantly the setting and role of the public schools in the great cities of America. The impact upon urban schools of a society in a perpetual state of ferment and transition is naturally profound. School administrators in the large cities must exercise superior leadership if education is to serve its crucial role of keeping our democracy viable in a difficult era of change and transition.

The myriad pressures exerted upon administrators in the great cities is perhaps unparalleled in the history of educational administration in this country. The complexity and pervasiveness of racial and other issues as well as the gravity of the problems to be solved are awesome to contemplate particularly at a time when financial resources are shrinking in relation to the acute educational needs of the large cities.

An analysis of issues such as the adequacy of the administrative structure of large city school systems or the import of increasing teacher militancy has important implications for any attempt to improve urban education in the United States. A constructive assault on racial and other problems can be more meaningfully mounted if the unique structural and operational milieu of urban school administration is understood. Very little attention has been devoted by students of educational administration to the specific and unique problems of administering schools in the great cities of America. The literature in educational administration is replete with generalizations which have little relevance to the very special problems of operating large city school systems.

OBJECTIVES

The major objective of the Seminar was to identify and attempt to delineate the multi-faceted issues which confront school administrators in the great cities of America. Much heat and often very little light has been focused upon the difficult problems faced by large city school systems. These problems can be solved or ameliorated only if they are understood. Throughout the Seminar emphasis was placed upon identifying research projects which might provide some answers to the host of difficult problems confronting large city school administrators. Chapter III of this report is devoted to an analysis of the research implications of the Seminar.

PROCEDURES

Experienced administrators represented thirteen of the Great Cities Research Council's member school systems at the Seminar. These administrators represented years of first-hand experience in dealing with the problems under discussion. Also invited as participants in the Seminar were representatives from educational agencies, organizations, colleges, and universities who were specialists in such fields ~~such~~ as educational administration, research design, and political science and who had particular interests in large city educational problems.

The Seminar program was structured around the presentations found in Chapter II of this report. A perusal of the list of presentors indicates how fortunate the Seminar was to acquire the services of such an outstanding group of speakers. The Planning Committee in structuring the Seminar recognized that in the time available it would not have been possible to cover all the complex problem areas of large city administration that merited attention. The topics discussed at the

Seminar can in no way be considered exhaustive but do reflect some major areas of concern of large city school administration. For example, a problem of increasing significance, namely the relationship between large city school systems and the federal government was not discussed extensively. The Planning Committee in the Spring of 1965 felt that the guidelines of the new legislation were still uncertain and that crystallization of the major issues in federal-school system relationships would still not have taken place by the time the Seminar convened on August 1, 1965.

The various topics discussed in the Seminar were introduced initially to the participants by the several consultants in the papers found in Chapter II of this report. After their presentations the speakers were questioned at length by the Seminar participants who were asked to focus attention specifically on the research implications of the presentations. General session discussions with the presentors of papers were supplemented by small group sessions at which the participants were asked to delineate and outline problems of large city school administration which could and should be researched.

The major goal of the Seminar was to help crystallize urgent urban educational problems and to identify through the interaction of large city school administrators and representatives of colleges and universities the types of research projects which might be undertaken in an effort to improve education in the great cities of America. The Seminar participants and planners have no illusions about what they were able to achieve in the short space of five days. If they were able, however, to pinpoint a few of the major problem areas that require research, and if some of the needed research identified in skeletal form in Chapter III is undertaken, then this exploratory seminar would have achieved its primary purpose.

If the educational crisis in our great cities is to be alleviated administrators must be in a better position to make critical decisions on the basis of substantive research. Fortunately and at long last, needed funds for educational research are becoming available. Let us hope that these funds will be used to support research endeavors that will help provide beleagured large city school administrators with solid informational bases on which to predicate critically important decisions.

SCHOOL SYSTEM--COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COOPERATION

If the results of investments in research are to be maximized, it is imperative that closer relationships and better communication be established between city school systems and college or university researchers. As Chapter III will indicate, different conceptions or interpretations of the purposes of research are often held by college or university researchers and practicing administrators and school system research directors.

At several points in the Seminar this cleavage about the means and ends of research manifested itself. The differences were discussed openly and candidly but remained largely unresolved. Perhaps the most important contribution that the Seminar made was to dramatize to all the participants the acute need for increased dialogue and communication on an intra- and inter-institutional basis between researchers and administrators in higher education and their counterparts in large city school systems.

THE REPORT OF THE SEMINAR

The remainder of this Chapter is devoted to Calvin Gross' keynote address presented on the opening evening of the Seminar. The participants are particularly indebted to Dr. Gross for his incisive and challenging presentation which enabled the Seminar to get off to an excellent start.

Chapter II incorporates the major presentations by the Seminar consultants.

Chapter III summarizes the research implications of the Seminar and concludes with a presentation by David Clark.

URGENT ISSUES IN THE BIG CITIES: IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

Calvin E. Gross
Dean, School of Education
University of Missouri at Kansas City

Big-city school systems are changing as rapidly as the metropolitan complexes which embrace them. To be candid we must confess that our concern and perplexity over the problems raised by urban transformation are greater than our capacity to devise promising or enduring solutions. This has not always been the case. Twenty years ago, there would have been little interest in the theme of this conference. In those days, the problems of education were considered to be mainly in rural and fringe areas, and large city systems were acknowledged to contain the "lighthouse schools" of the day. Since then, shifting balances in resources, population, and educational requirements have combined with the inflexibilities of municipal boundaries and legislative apportionment to bankrupt urban schools of whatever advantages they may once have possessed, replacing them with the matrix of issues which presently give us concern.

The particular problems of the great cities of America, per se, were first acknowledged and attacked by an informal but powerful liaison which came to be known as the Great Cities Program for School Improvement. Benjamin Willis, Samuel Brownell, and Harold Vincent, the superintendents of schools respectively in Chicago, Detroit, and Milwaukee put their heads together one day in 1957 to ask themselves three questions--what are the disabling educational characteristics peculiar to the great cities, what are some handholds by which to grapple with them, and what kind of organization might work best?

Superintendents, board members, and a few staff representatives of fifteen of the largest cities in the country were soon meeting, with considerable continuity of attendance, three or four times a year. They found a remarkable commonality in their problems, including the distressing phenomenom that in local, state, and national educational conclaves of every variety they were uniformly out-numbered and overwhelmed, and that in the privy councils where decisions are made, they were often ignored. For all their power and wealth and influence they found themselves curiously isolated and impotent.

Those were the days when Mark Schinnerer was saying, "In our state legislatures we are represented by the acre, not by the head," and Sam Brownell proclaimed that, "The new frontiers of America lie in her great cities."

Attacks were made in rapid order on vocational education, cultural deprivation, fiscal policy, and teacher education. Along the way attention has been given at various times to public relations, buildings and sites, teacher organizations, and methods of board member selection.

Today it is generally realized that these and other problems of the great cities are no longer their exclusive concern. Increasingly, migrations, urban growth and decay, and new laws are pushing the problems of the cities outward to the suburbs and the metropolitan fringes. Just as the cities were the first, but not the last possessors of "lighthouse schools," they also promise to have been the first but not the last centers of drop-outs, militant teachers, ethnic concentrations, and declining tax bases. It is also true that many of the problems are not new ones, but merely the same old questions, compounded and dressed up in new trappings. I think that this conference might serve best by addressing itself to how to provoke the best thinking in the country, and to set in motion the research and the investigations which will begin to produce new answers.

I suggest that it would be profitable to examine the big trends--the powerful trends--and to look ten or twenty or one hundred years ahead. Some trends do indeed appear to be of centennial significance. I would place in this category the basic questions of who is to govern and make policy for our schools, trends and developments in the ethnic characteristics of the population, and the ebb and flow of urban versus rural dominance. With regard to the last, for example, we could profitably inquire what form of urban-rural symbiosis might prove to be most dynamic and creative for America. But before getting into such meaty and intriguing matters as these let us consider first some which, while more prosaic, are perennial and equally pressing to the administrator who has to deal with them. These problems, nowadays, are equally meaningful outside and inside the city.

Take the question of staffing, for instance. While I was in Weston, Massachusetts, a suburb, we had thirty-five applicants for each teaching position. When I first arrived in Pittsburgh, we had one teacher applicant for each vacancy, but were able, after raising salaries, to get two. Then I went to New York City and found that school used to open in the Fall without teachers for four hundred classrooms. During my first year there, the Bedford-Stuyvesant area did not have a teacher assigned to every room until February. And I don't mean a regular teacher --I mean a warm body. The problem is not only to get teachers into slum classrooms, but to keep them there. Teachers transfer from these positions so rapidly in New York City that in a few schools the average amount of experience is less than a year.

Several recent efforts have been made to provide a fair share of the best teachers for inner city schools. New York early proposed the establishment of an elite teacher corps in which the members would be paid an additional $1,000 per year for teaching wherever they might be assigned. The United Federation of Teachers promptly dubbed the proposed differential "combat pay," the opposition rallied around the slogan, and the board of education tabled the proposition.

A more promising solution to this problem in New York has been the introduction of the "More Effective Schools," ten the first year, and ten more the next. Additional services and materials are furnished to inner city schools on a saturation basis, and teachers are recruited and assigned _en bloc_, rather than singly, so that they are reinforced by colleagues who are also highly competent, and do not feel like lonesome soldiers in forward foxholes. This program is expensive (about $400 extra per pupil) to implement on a very large scale. While the going is slow, the results are encouraging.

A measure which holds perhaps the ultimate promise for staffing slum schools is the special training of new teachers. New teacher education programs which stimulate professional sensitivity to cultural differences and an eagerness to serve in disadvantaged areas will demand new kinds of cooperative relationships between school systems and universities, new sources of fiscal support, imaginative curricular innovations, and extensive student recruitment and selection procedures. Any long range solution to staffing urban schools probably rests upon the successful and massive development of such programs. But if we can succeed, much else that is of acute urban concern will fall quietly into place, because good teachers are the key to any effective educational enterprise.

Another matter of general concern to practicing administrators is that of collective bargaining or, if you prefer, professional negotiations. Teachers are on the move. They are militant. A rapid series of urban successes by the American Federation of Teachers and the increasingly vigorous reaction of the National Education Association has set into motion an inexorable procession of events.

There are important questions to be asked and answered. For example, does the trend to collective bargaining and increased teacher militancy change the role of the superintendent? From my vantage point it certainly appears to change what he does. Conducting union negotiations on behalf of a school board demands huge amounts of time from the superintendent and his staff and requires professional advice and counsel in bargaining strategies.

Teacher negotiations bring a school system and its chief administrator closer to the sources of community dynamics. An organized group of teachers, affiliated with the national union movement and voicing its demands through the local, and probably the national, press constitutes strong and intentional pressure on politicians bent on maintaining their prestige and influence. The seat of power is the source of money, and there the teachers will inevitably go.

While the implication may appear to be that the superintendent will surrender both authority and leadership in any emerging relationship, I doubt it. There must unquestionably be some realignments among relationships, but there is little likelihood that the superintendent of schools will soon abandon either of his roles as chief executive of the board and professional leader of the teachers.

Although to some people finance is a prosaic subject, others are passionately concerned, and it remains a matter of enduring concern to school administrators. We are all aware of the huge disparities in expenditure patterns from district to district and, consequently, from child to child. Likewise, we are familiar with the heavy and often inequitable tax burdens at the municipal level. Unfortunately, it is often where the tax burden is greatest that educational demands are most pressing. I speak of the cities, with their surpassing need for more space and renovated buildings, for compensatory education programs, and for salary schedules which compete with adjacent suburbs. These same cities contribute an inordinate share to the police and fire protection, parks, streets, and sanitation facilities which benefit the entire metropolitan area. The reality of municipal overburden creates the dilemma of the irresistible force and the immovable object. On one hand is the tremendous compression under the demand for increased educational expenditures; on the other is the crushing weight of already inflated tax rates. Neither the taxpayer nor the educational partisan is apt to be satisfied with the result.

A still more untenable situation exists when the resources available are not intelligently procured or applied or, even worse, are used for political purposes. Such funds are better not spent. The educational economics of megalopolis will continue to provide significant fodder for interested researchers and practitioners.

The hard facts of social change are forcing us to revise our conceptions about what constitutes adequacy in a school building or a site. At one time, we all learned rules of thumb such as the adage that an elementary school should be placed on a site of not less than five acres plus one acre for every hundred children. Likewise, many of us very early came to the conclusion that a "three deep" elementary school represents an optimum size. Convinced of this, I went to

Pittsburgh and found some very good 1,000 pupil schools. Not to stop here, when I arrived in New York, I found that 1,200 pupil elementary schools were the norm, and promptly landed in a spirited debate with the City Council and the borough president of Manhattan who thought they should house 1,800. I learned that in Manhattan it often takes a million dollars to buy an elementary school site and as many as 500 families must be displaced.

It is clear that the old rules which once served New York and elsewhere are no longer valid. We are going to get used to outlandish population densities and the demands which they place upon school housing (not to mention people). The cost of land in urban centers is now so great that schools merely three stories high, much less surrounding playground space, are not feasible economically in areas anything like Manhattan. In some places you must build wherever you can find free air space. In New York, for example, a high school is going up over the Hutchinson River Parkway. We have reached the place where we must begin to think about multi-level schools, one stacked above the other. How to build them, use them safely, and administer them are questions awaiting answers in the years ahead.

Having addressed myself to some of the conventional questions, let me return to comment upon the centennial issues which I mentioned at the outset of my remarks. One of these is the governance of the public schools. The classical conception of school governance in which the people collectively possess ultimate authority and choose a school board which in turn selects a superintendent and holds him to the distilled will of "the people" is a fading ideal. In many districts the system has already broken down and in the biggest cities it positively wheezes. It is doubtful in any metropolis that the board retains representative contact with the people, and it is certain that the superintendent recognizes pressures from sources other than his board in making decisions. It is further apparent that the old policy-administration dichotomy so often used to delineate board and superintendent responsibilities is breaking down as outside agencies participate in making policy, and school boards dabble in administration.

Some people, including both superintendents and school board members, have speculated about what might happen if boards were done away with altogether. In cities where the school board is eager to dance to the mayor's tune, the superintendent might as well become a cabinet officer of the mayor, and the school a city department. Or, the answer might be that the federal government would fill the vacuum, a frightening prospect for several reasons. Despite this and other unattractive alternatives the question remains of whether or not the school board system represents the ultimately viable form of governance for every school district.

The relationship between integration and education is perhaps the emotional and ethical issue of our time. Housing patterns, population shifts, and social apathy have placed this problem squarely upon the schools. While it is not of their making, neither is it theirs to ignore. They must deal with it, because instruction and integration are irrevocably interrelated.

Poor scholastic achievement and ethnic concentration are highly associated statistically. Regardless of the relative juxtaposition of cause and effect, the schools have been enjoined to develop effective solutions simultaneously for both. Time, energy, perseverance, intelligence and good will are all required to accomplish what must be done.

Finally, I must touch upon the issue of urban-rural relations. All of us associated with urban schools have felt that legislative redistricting would provide much-needed relief from non-city domination in our state legislatures. Now we have a Supreme Court ruling which holds for redistricting, and I must confess to some concern about a sudden flip-flop. While we hope that state legislatures will now show interest in ameliorating the unique financial and administrative problems besetting schools in metropolitan areas, it remains important for these bodies to render equitable treatment to rural educational interests.

Who dominates whom within the political arena in which schools must compete for resources and favorable legislation is an age-old game. Currently the suburbs seem to hold the balance of power. I know that when I was in Weston, no one paid much attention to the schools in Boston. Then when I arrived in Pittsburgh, it fell upon me to clean up the last bits of acrimony left over from the days when the city lorded it over the embryonic suburbs. Cities formerly could bask in a certain provincialism, content in the assurance that their situation was unique and that their programs and staff were superior to those in the outlands. But not any longer. Today, the suburbs have resources, staffs, and programs which rival those of the central city. More importantly, they now, and will increasingly, share the problems of the city. The achievements of our technology, the mobility of our population, and the demands of our people have thus placed us in the position where the cooperative skills of all people knowledgeable and interested in educating children are urgently needed.

CHAPTER II

SEMINAR PRESENTATIONS

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION IN LARGE CITIES:

A POLITICAL SCIENTIST'S VIEWPOINT

David W. Minar
Department of Political Science and
Center for Metropolitan Studies
Northwestern University

This paper is about the point of overlap of two relatively undeveloped areas of political science research, the politics of the big city and the politics of the public school system. Neither has been a major object of systematic attention by the political science discipline. The big city has probably been neglected because of the relative neatness and manageability of research on the small and middle-sized town; the public school has probably been neglected because it simply has not often occurred to scholars that the government of the schools is a political phenomenon. It is interesting to discover that the most recent widely noted book on city politics has not one reference to either "schools" or "education" in its index. This trivial fact symbolizes the state of the political science of the urban school system. There are, of course, various signs of new life. A few case studies of big city politics have appeared in the past several years, though for the most part they are not very systematic and not at all comparative.[1] And in growing numbers political scientists have turned to the school system as an admirable field for the observation of certain aspects of the political process.[2] We have surely passed the stage where it was necessary to explain what political science has to do with the provision of educational services. However, the fascinating field with which we are dealing is still rich, verdant, and relatively untouched.

---

[1] See, for example, Wallace S. Sayre and Herbert Kaufman, Governing New York City (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1965); Edward C. Banfield Political Influence (New York: Free Press, 1961); and the reports on city politics compiled (mimeo) by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard, under the editorship of Edward C. Banfield.

[2] The leading recent piece was Thomas H. Eliot's "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics," American Political Science Review, LII (December, 1959),

A practical consequence of this state of affairs is that any discussion of the political science of big city education can rest very little on hard, systematic, comparative evidence in which we can have great confidence. Thus, what follows is in good part speculation. Fortunately, our assignment is to raise questions and stimulate research, not to submit answers. The generalizations we suggest should be received with that qualification firmly in mind. They should also be read with the suspicion that must be accorded any attempt to generalize without much data about a broad generic category like "big American cities." Even if we define our category as the biggest fifteen, we are still dealing with fifteen political systems that operate in fifteen cultural settings nearly as different in some ways as the cultures of the states of Western Europe. This is not to say that generalization is impossible, but only that it is to be regarded with caution. Perhaps little we can say now will have _prima facie_ applicability to all big city situations, but surely enough can be said to stimulate new perspectives on the urban environment in which so much of contemporary American life is set. If this is the best we can do, if we can only speak without precision and certainty, we can still provide ourselves with the framework for a better social science for the future.

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SHAPE OF TODAY'S BIG CITIES

This is not the place to attempt an urban sociology or to rehearse the familiar generalizations about what today's city life is like. There are, however, a few central features of the picture that have a direct bearing on our purpose, and we should be reminded of these. Perhaps we might begin by suggesting that there

---

1132-50. See also articles in R. S. Cahill and S. P. Hencley, _The Politics of Education in the Local Community_ (Danville: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1964), and some of the titles in the series "The Economics and Politics of Public Education" from the Syracuse University Press.

are two broad types of big cities in America now, those that are still on the rise and those that are on the decline.[3] Roughly speaking, the former are young and located in the Southwest, the latter are old and Eastern or Midwestern. The former are the products of the automobile age, the latter the products of the age of waterways, railroads, and streetcars. The former are geographically, economically, and culturally dispersed, the latter much more confined and concentrated.[4]

In sheer numbers, the older cities still dominate the over-all American urban picture. As we will have reason to suggest later, however, the newer cities may tell us more about our urban future. There is much that differentiates the two types, including much that bears heavily on styles of life, political problems, and political processes.[5] At the same time, the two types have a great deal in common, including some overriding social characteristics that tend to influence heavily the educational system. For the most part, what follows will be concerned with the common features and their consequences, though perhaps our discussion will lean in some degree toward the more widespread phenomena of the older urban area.

For several generations large American cities have served as staging areas for the national culture, as ports of entry through which candidates for assimilation passed. With the legislated decline in immigration of the mid-1920's this process did not cease, for internal shifts of population have sustained the flow of the uninitiated into urban areas. This flow, of course, has in recent years been made up largely of members of "visible" minority groups: Negroes, Puerto

---

[3] Taken strictly in terms of 1950-1960 population change, ten of the largest cities lost ground (Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Washington) and five gained (Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, New Orleans). United States Census Bureau, City and County Data Book, 1962 (A Statistical Abstract Supplement), (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962), Table 6.

[4] Compare, for example, the following population densities (per square mile): New York, 24,705; Philadelphia, 15,768; Chicago, 15,850; Boston, 14,525; Los Angeles, 5,448; Houston, 2,860; Dallas, 2,027. Compiled from ibid.

[5] See Scott Greer, Governing the Metropolis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), pp. 9-21.

Ricans, and American Indians, along with rural whites.[6] At the same time, the cities have seen a steady outward flow, particularly of middle and lower-middle income families, to their suburbanizing hinterlands. Thus the members of visible minorities have made up increasing proportions of large city populations. While ten of the fifteen largest cities declined in population between 1950 and 1960, every one of the fifteen saw an increase in the proportion of non-whites. Only five had fewer than 20 percent non-whites by 1960, and these proportions have doubtless grown in the intervening period.[7]

This means that the cities have continued to occupy the role of socializing agencies; the city has been and will be for some time to come a great teaching machine, introducing people to the larger flow of metropolitan life and its ways. The job must now be done, however, under somewhat more difficult circumstances than it was in years past. The reasons for its greater difficulty apply differentially from place to place. The main factors, however, would seem to be these: (1) Because of long-standing cultural prejudices that affect the receptivity of society, the visible minorities *per se* are harder to "process" to assimilation. (2) Because of the changing shape of demands for labor and locational shifts in economic enterprise, the members of urban minorities find it difficult to sustain themselves and improve their occupational status. (3) The physical plant of the city, both public and private, is deteriorating and obsolete. (4) The resource (i.e., revenue) base of the city is contracting as a result of the shifts in population, the economic characteristics and the physical obsolescence mentioned above. (5) These shifts have also robbed the central city of many of its traditional leadership resources. (6) The mounting thrust for equality of treatment for minorities has raised the level of consciousness of the city's socializational function.

---

[6] Cf. Raymond W. Mack, "The Changing Ethnic Fabric of the Metropolis," in B. J. Chandler, *et*. *al*., eds., *Education in Urban Society* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1962), pp. 54-69.

[7] U. S. Bureau of Census, *op*. *cit*.

The consequences of these conditions for the urban body politic are many, and perhaps the most acute of them have direct bearing on public education. When we speak of the city's major problem being socialization, we highlight both the centrality and the difficulty of today's city school system. For socialization is inherently a teaching process. While we do not know with any precision the relative contributions of family, school, other institutions, and the life routine itself to the socialization of new urbanites, we do know that we expect much of the school. Thus educators are supposed, whether realistically or not, to lead the society in its efforts to deal with its biggest job. In a limited way it is not unfair to say that the schools are being called upon to solve the city's problems. From the standpoint of demands or what we might call social inputs, the situation of the big city school system has changed in three fundamental ways: first, the quality of demands has changed, i.e., new qualities are expected of the services the schools render; second, new groups, organized and unorganized, have entered the urban and hence the educational picture;[8] third, the support base for the educational function has changed with respect to revenue and leadership.

THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE OF THE GREAT CITY

At the same time that these things are going on in urban political society, other developments have been under way in the city's political structure. A little loose historical reconstruction may help us understand the character of the political system called upon to respond to today's demands on the city.

It is no longer widely supposed that city politics is the politics of the boss and his machine. Whether or not vestiges of the machine remain, its main features have disappeared, and most cities have come one or two steps beyond it. During the age of the urban machine, the city was dominated by those who held office and reaped the benefits that went with it, the "spoils" of patronage. The medium of exchange in the machine city was votes, and the machine flourished because of the presence of a large number of "vulnerables" in urban society who needed things for which their votes could be traded, chiefly "small" favors. These were particularly the poor, the recently-arrived, and the small businessmen.[9] In structure, the machine was usually a hierarchy of go-betweens connecting those who delivered the votes and those who controlled the distribution of rewards.

---

[8] See the comments of Sayre and Kaufman in their "Introduction to the Paperbound Edition" of op. cit., p. xlii.

As the social character of the city changed, so did the social foundation on which the machine had rested. This shift came about gradually, of course, and at different times in different places. Analyses of the decline of the machine tend to emphasize the critical importance of the decrease in immigration and the inception of public, particularly federal, welfare programs. These factors doubtless cut the numbers and the vulnerability of urban vulnerables. Another factor that worked in the same direction, perhaps at even greater force, was change in the structure of economic enterprise. With the expansion and stabilization of the corporation, the small business began to give way, at least in proportionate influence, to the big one. The latter, being big and often national in scope, had greater powers of resistance and less particularized interests, and was thus less dependent on the machine's favors.[10]

What succeeded the machine as the typical urban form is not so clear. In many cases it may have been a "power elite" of economic notables.[11] This type of structure is based not on control of votes and office but on ability to impress those who do make authoritative policy (or refuse to make it). Those who hold this power are people of achieved or inherited position who work behind the scenes to pull the strings that make the policy process go. Their participation in the process may be self-interested, or it may be based on a sense of civic obligation, a political *noblesse oblige*. In any case they eschew public office and, often, the public eye.

---

[9] See the analysis of Robert Merton in Social Theory and Social Structure (rev. ed.; New York: Free Press, 1957), pp. 72-82.

[10] Greer, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-68.

[11] The most important early uses of this model are Robert and Helen Lynd, Middletown (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929); and Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

Many words have been spent in social science over whether these monolithic power elites actually do exist and how to find out if they do. It would not serve our purpose to review the literature of this dispute here.[12] Speculation and impression suggest strongly that some cities were controlled this way during the period when the machine was dwindling away, particularly where the pace and distribution of economic growth were such as to facilitate the influence of the few.

Impression and some evidence also suggest, however, that the era of the power elite may have been a passing phase that the city has now transcended. The power-conspiracy version of the urban world is temptingly simple, but probably too simple to describe accurately the great city of today. It seems likely that most contemporary cities are much more loosely governed from many more dispersed centers of power than the elite model supposes. The complexity of the urban social structure and such economic changes as the growth of the national (and metropolitan) corporation have made the city increasingly difficult to manage through any integrated, privately-based structure.

A more typical form today is probably pluralistic, a set of smaller and shifting centers of power that take shape around specific clusters of policy interests.[13] Thus, city politics is what Norton Long has called an "ecology of games," a flexible, shifting interplay of forces whose actors vary as the problems at issue vary.[14] Influence in such a city is not confined to economic dominants; indeed, in many cases the economic elite seems to have abdicated its role of civic responsibility except where its obvious self-interest is at stake. The particular shape of a given game is determined by the stakes of that game, though with certain interests having a semi-permanent advantage.

---

[12] See especially Robert A. Dahl, "A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model," *American Political Science Review*, LII (June, 1958), 463-69; Nelson Polsby, *Community Power and Political Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963); Thomas J. Anton, "Power, Pluralism, and Local Politics," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, VII (March, 1963), 425-57.

[13] Robert A. Dahl, *Who Governs?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

[14] Norton E. Long, "The Local Community as an Ecology of Games," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV (November, 1958), 251-61.

It would appear that in cities of the pluralistic type, a special and important part may often be played by those with political authority, especially, for example, by the big city mayor. What a pluralistic system is most likely to lack is over-all coordination and perspective. This the mayor can supply. He can become an identifier of proposals, a go-between, a negotiator among the forces, public and private, that play in the urban game. In playing this part, the mayor can be the most visible point in the system, for his is the point of convergence of all major civic efforts. Thus he may seem to be a leader, even if his role is substantially that of broker of power and programs. The central function of big city politics is this function of brokerage among a multiplicity of interests.[15]

Contemporary city politics shows one other feature that must be emphasized, the considerable and growing influence of bureaucratic technical expertise. The importance of the hired expert is more visible and doubtless proportionately greater in the smaller community than in the large city. It is most prominently apparent in many places where the city manager clearly has the upper hand, in policy initiative as well as in administrative control. Although the manager plan has not been used in large cities, these places have certainly felt the growing need for technical leadership. In a variety of such fields as health, welfare, planning, and policing the city must call on the experts, and the advancing complexity of urban life pushes toward more, not less, such reliance in the future. The age of municipal technology is with us, and while political forms may ordinarily lag behind social realities, we may expect that in the next stage of urban political development the technical expert will play a predominant role. What shape the technician-dominated system will take and how the expert is to be controlled may be the vital questions for our urban future.[16]

---

[15] Although phrased somewhat differently, this seems to be the theme of the interpretation of Chicago politics advanced in Banfield, Political Influence, op. cit., and that of New York politics found in Sayre and Kaufman, op. cit.

THE PECULIAR PLACE OF EDUCATION IN THE POLITICS OF TODAY'S BIG CITY

Having reviewed the social situation and political structure of the city in general terms, we may now turn to the place of public education in the urban picture. At the level of gross description, such terms as "ambiguous" and "problematic" obviously seem apropos. What can we say that takes us beyond this level? As an earlier section of this paper suggested, the demands on the urban educational system have not grown less, while the conditions under which they are to be satisfied grow ever more complex. What of the decision-making system through which these particular demands are to be met?

Traditionally, American educational organization has been heavily influenced by the push toward separation from the other functions of the community. The overarching political importance of education as a means to social progress has virtually been a part of the American credo, but it has been thought best to shelter the process of education itself from the world of political action. This isolation reflects, perhaps, a societal urge to protect the young from the influence of politics, a sphere of activity Americans have tended to regard as unsavory. In recent years, too, as society generally has undergone greater functional specialization, the educational process has been professionalized and therefore regarded as a process to be understood and controlled by expertise.

The effects, of course, are mixed. Formal authority over the schools has been retained in lay hands, and the schools have not always been insulated from municipal politics. Particularly in the past, many school systems have been dominated or exploited by bosses and by power elites, often for quite un-educational purposes. The thrust, however, has been otherwise. The interference of politicians has notably declined in most places, even where formal appointive powers remain with them. Through legislative change and the evolution of usage, school government has moved closer to separation and professional control.[17]

---

[16] This, of course, is a manifestation of the classic problem of bureaucracy.

The current dilemma of the schools may arise from just this situation. The school men of the large cities, in other words, may have become technical experts before their time. It is interesting to compare the use of expertise in general management with its use in school administration in the big municipalities. The manager plan, as such, has not been employed in the big cities to any significant extent.[18] Presumably it has not been thought adaptable to or acceptable within the political framework that holds the large community together. As the conditions of government have changed, the big city has responded to the need for technical-professional leadership on a specialist basis, rather than by hiring an over-all administrative manager. In a few cities, general management leadership has been instituted through the person of a "chief administrative officer."[19] His functions have, however, been more restricted than those of the manager under the orthodox manager plan, and, more importantly, the C.A.O. has been seen as the principal administrative aide of an explicitly political mayor. Thus, in the big city the technicians have been sheltered by political leadership that can effectively exercise the political "brokerage" function.

---

[17] For a discussion of separation from a political scientist's perspective, see Roscoe C. Martin, Government and the Suburban School ("The Economics and Politics of Public Education, 2," Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963); also Edward M. Tuttle, School Board Leadership in America (Danville: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958).

[18] Only one (Dallas) of the largest fifteen cities uses the council-manager form, only three other cities of more than 500,000 (San Antonio, San Diego, Cincinnati) use it. Of 30 cities in the 250,000-500 000 category, only 12 have managers. See International City Managers' Association, Recent Council-Manager Developments and Directory of Council-Manager Cities (Chicago: International City Managers' Association, 1961). Note that these large cities have mostly been places of rapid population growth in recent years, and that they adopted the plan when much smaller in size.

[19] See Wallace S. Sayre, "The General Manager Idea for Large Cities," Public Administration Review, XIV (Autumn, 1954), 253-58.

The situation of school government has typically been quite different. For reasons noted above, the school administrators have been role-defined as technical leaders and set off from the conventional channels of political activity. Boards of education, which formally link the schools to the authority system, tend not to develop strong, cohesive leadership patterns, and their members are not likely to be political insiders. In the smaller and relatively homogeneous place, professional educators are able to operate, in their own spheres, much like city managers. They build trust and exhibit capacities that enable them to administer with relatively free hands, and in the nature of things they also assume a great deal of policy leadership. In the big and heterogeneous city, however, professional municipal administrators have ordinarily had a kind of political protection (or direction, depending on how one wants to see it) that educational administrators no longer have.

The effects of this arrangement vary with local political circumstances. In places and times of social placidity, the educational system takes its guidelines from standards of professional excellence. While its objective quality is conditioned by the abilities of those in control and the resources available, it is free from the distraction and plunder of politics. On the other hand, when the social seas get rough the system may founder, for its commanders know how to keep the decks clean but not how to trim the sails. The educational administrators tend not to be oriented toward doing the political function and not to have others at hand to do it for them.

Today is not a time of placidity in the big cities, it is a time of troubles. It is, as we pointed out above, a time when extraordinary demands are made on the schools, and when resources are on the decline. The very success of American society, symbolized in affluence, has made it impatient of imperfection in important enterprises. Easily the biggest specific source of trouble for the schools, of course, is the demand for equal opportunity for minority children, stated in ever more intense and pervasive terms.

All of these major issues for urban education have overriding political dimensions, and they are the subject of new forces and tactics on the political scene. Perhaps the important point, however, is that they have developed at the juncture in time when the educational sector of the political system is ill-equipped to handle them. They call for skillful performance of the political brokerage function. But those who are responsible are not used to being brokers, and those who are brokers are not responsible. While the school system has achieved protection from politics, politicians have also achieved some protection from the issues that plague the schools. Neither protection, of course, is complete, as the recent experiences of some big city mayors have forceably demonstrated. The place of education in the system, however, is such that there are few smooth relationships and accustomed routines through which the political leadership and the educational leadership together can be brought to confront urban problems. The dilemma is inherent in the shape of the system.

The solution of school problems is further handicapped by the political, social, and economic facts of metropolitan fragmentation. Because of the flight to the suburbs, the political leaders of the central city do not have a balanced social situation with which they can work. The metropolitan relationship tends to seal the city's problems in, to confine them to a part of the larger "natural" city--the entire metropolis. Thus the central city gets little help in financial or leadership contributions from the suburbs, and for the social groups most acutely affected the suburb does not even serve as an escape hatch. In the absence of any serious prospect for "metro" government in most places, this multi-dimensional segregation probably will have the effect of compelling the central city to look to the state and national governments for ever-increasing support and guidance. Whether this will have good consequences for policy and policy-making in the city may very much be doubted.

From a political scientist's point of view, then, the problem for big city schools would seem to be to give them political means for solving their political problems. Neither the problems nor the democratic processes can be wished away. For the time being, school policy will have to respond to social demands as well as to standards of professional performance. School policy, like the policy of the entire municipality, will feel the pressures of new groups with new expectations. These already include not only the racial minorities but also better organized teachers, social workers, and other personnel. In the future they might even include the most down-trodden minority of all, the students, if recent developments in colleges and universities make their way down through the grades.

How is this alteration in educational government to come about? One thing is for sure: if there is a simple answer it is not an obvious one. Some standard prescriptions may readily be recommended: imagination, creativity, boldness, openness to change, communication, better training, and, above all, research. Beyond these the going gets harder. One suggestion does seem to flow from what we have been saying. Much more attention should be paid to the processes and structures of school government, and these need to be seen in their relation to the entire flow of community political life. The discussion of school issues tends to concentrate on policies, on what to do about curriculum, what to do about integration, what to do about teaching the disadvantaged, etc. These are most worthy points of focus. Without distracting resources from these efforts, we should put more into examination of how policies are made, into the study of decision-making processes. Processes are the channels through which the cues to socially satisfying policies are understood and translated into action. Old consensus-building routines may be doing more harm than good; the only way we can find out is to open our minds to the evidence, hopefully evidence systematically gathered and evaluated. Failures in the city's efforts to deal with its problems may at root be failures in institutional decision-making behavior.

Two other general lines of action may be suggested. Both are familiar, neither is easy, both are somewhat unpalatable. One is to induce school men to act more like politicians, to induce them to accept and act out their roles as brokers of political interest, as some few clearly do now. Even when educational administrators begin to behave this way, they must also continue to serve their functions as technical experts. We can no doubt train future generations of school administrators to do both. The dispiriting thing, of course, is that today's problems will not wait for a new generation. The second path of action, rather more complementary than contradictory to the first, leads toward pulling education into the main flow of city politics. To be sure, the municipal mechanisms often seem to have little to recommend them. But if political problems require political solutions, today's urban educational problems may best be treated through the community's recognizedly political institutions. On behalf of this position, it can also be argued that the city's various problems need to be handled as a whole, through coordinated policy, rather than in little lumps as though they were unrelated to each other. The close interconnections among education, housing, welfare, health, and the maintenance of order illustrate the point in an obvious way.

The situation that confronts urban education poses a cruel dilemma. In the short and middle run it seems to require political invigoration, however that invigoration can be accomplished. In the long run, it may, on the other hand, require less of political leadership and more of technical expertise. The social stresses that now plague our cities will not last forever; if, as we may suppose, the assimilation processes continue as they have in the past, the future city of the long run will be a place of fewer intergroup conflicts. The assimilation of visible minorities may be more difficult than assimilation has been before, but the society has never before been so self-conscious about assimilation. Nor has it been so affluent, a factor that should facilitate assimilation a good deal. Predictions about the time required to "settle" racial problems would be foolhardy, but these problems are not insoluble and may not take as long for solution as pessimism leads many to believe.

Social experience suggests, of course, that as old problems disappear new ones take their place. But it seems unlikely that the urban problems of tomorrow will require the same political treatment as those of today. Technological innovation will probably push the city in the direction of greater physical dispersion and higher levels of service. The old cities of today, as they replace physical plant, may come to look more and more like our "new" cities of the twentieth century. This trend, like others operating on today's world, will push toward greater reliance on technical expertise, and hence greater power in the hands of the technical expert. In the coming era the educator, like his counterpart professionals in other fields of community service, may well find himself with a freer hand and a heavier responsibility than ever before. Meanwhile, his problem is twofold: how to deal with a political today, and how to get ready in a political today for a technical tomorrow.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE LARGE CITIES OF AMERICA:
BOARD MEMBERS PERSPECTIVES

Harold Webb
Executive Director
National School Boards Association

Although all problems in education are important, probably none is more vital, pressing, and emotionally charged than is the unique situation that confronts us in the large urban school districts.

I interpret my assignment to address myself to the matter of politics and pressures as they relate to the school board member in our large cities. Now, it is one thing to accept such an assignment and another to discharge it. As I worked on this paper I came to realize I had accepted this assignment too readily. I find this matter so amorphous that I will not attempt to present a definitive paper on the subject of school boards and politics. Another ground rule I should like to make is that I will not be able to separate the superintendent (as well as a number of other officials--both school and non-school)--from our discussion of school boards and politics.

Two years ago, Mark Schinnerer, former Superintendent of the Cleveland Public Schools, speaking to the National Conference for Support of the Public Schools, said: "The frontier of American Democracy is the Great Cities of America. American Democracy will continue to live, or die, dependent upon what happens in the Great Cities." Schinnerer expressed the belief that education is the key to the solutions of the many problems that beset our large urban complexes.

It has been said that "for every solution, there is a resulting problem." Finding solutions for problems and finding subsequent solutions as they are required is a fact of life. As I understand it, one of the ultimate goals of this conference is to identify "researchable problems" relating to the administration of large city schools. It's not too difficult to define problems. It's the finding of solutions or remedies that causes consternation in many quarters. On the other hand, as one wag put it: the answers are easy and everyone knows them; the difficult part is to find the right questions.

I will attempt today to discuss some facets of politics in education as they affect the school board member.

"Politics" is defined as --"the science or art of government; theory or methods of managing affairs of government, especially the method of party management or support and sometimes--party intrigue." The element of intrigue is further outlined in the dictionary definition of "politic": prudent, shrewd, crafty, cunning--expedient, as a plan.

Life is often a study in contrasts. It is interesting to note that preceding the definition of the above terms one can find the word--"polite"--meaning well bred in manner, courteous or obliging, refined, cultivated! There could well be a moral here! However, I will leave that search for you to make.

Sidney Hillman said, "Politics is the science of how who gets what, when and why." Or according to another approach by Henry Adams, "Practical politics consists of ignoring the facts!" Perhaps George Washington came close when he said in his Farewell Address in the year 1796, "The basis of our political system is the right of people to make their constitutions of government."

Washington's concept is appropriate to describe the historic system of local control of public education in the United States. Individual boards of education are the representatives of the people they serve and as such they strive to express the will of the people in the important task of educating the youth of America.

The local board of education is an agency of the State, the legal instrument through which local control and responsiveness to the voters is maintained. More than 95 percent of the school board members in this country are elected by the vote of the people. A majority of the board members are elected or chosen on a non-partisan basis.

In a study of forty-two large city school systems recently completed by the

National School Boards Association, it was found that thirty boards are elected, eleven appointed. It was interesting to me to learn that one board is both appointed and elected--one member of the board is appointed while the remaining four members are elected. Of the thirty boards which are elected, twenty-three are elected at the time of general elections and seven at special elections. Only three boards are elected on a partisan basis.

If there is one thing a new school board member learns soon after taking office, it is that he becomes aware of numerous forces (and pressures) in the community which he never noticed or felt before. If everyone held the same ideals about what constitutes a "good education" or the best way to manage the school system, the board member's task would be an easy one. Obviously, this is not the case--far from it. Any ten people will usually have almost as many different ideas about any aspect of education. Difference of opinions and beliefs form one of the basic tenets of American democracy and, at the same time, one of the board member's greatest challenges.

The school board, as the official body accountable for what happens in the school, is subject to all the pressures which can be exerted by various groups and individuals intent upon making their voice heard and their will felt.

Roald Campbell, in a consultant's paper for the 1965 White House Conference in Education, says:

> Continued attacks by parents, civil rights groups, university professors, and people in foundations and agencies of the Federal Government make board members and administrators overly sensitive to criticism, particularly when many remedial measures are already being tried and the critics seem to have little appreciation of the total range of problems, including shortage of funds, being faced by school people.

H. Thomas James, in another consultant's paper for the White House Conference, contends (in an interesting mixture of cynicism and insight) that many on school boards

> . . . have a marked distaste for controversy and public uproar, and will usually attempt to reduce conflict rather than extend it. Therefore, some of the most consequential educational issues of our time, because they have been the most violently controversial, have too often been sidestepped by

> boards of education, and so have had to be resolved in the less squeamish but more realistic arenas of partisan politics.

I doubt if many people, whether on school boards or not, enjoy intense controversy and public uproar. But, I believe we do have school boards who do not shrink from it when they believe the course they have taken is proper and just.

Dr. Archie Dykes, Director of the Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education in Memphis, has made some observations as to the trends he believes will develop as a result of some of these pressures and changes in our society. In the Teachers College Record for February, 1965, Dykes predicted: (1) the relative influence of the board will decline while the decision making of the superintendent will increase; (2) the superintendent will deal increasingly with groups other than the school board; (3) the superintendent will have more autonomy; (4) the dichotomy between policy-making and administration will disappear; (5) the superintendent's administrative power will increase; and (6) during this transition period greater conflict potential lies ahead between the board and the superintendent.

Whether Mr. Dykes will be proven correct or not, several implications are evident. State and national governmental agencies will attempt to make more of the solutions to certain crucial problems on the local scene--witness the course already taken by various programs of the Economic Opportunity Act. We are in a time of great social, political and cultural change. No individual, group, official body or organization can avoid the thrust of the evaluation and reassessment which our society is making of its institutions. It is a political fact of life that our educational system, with all its promises and short-comings, has been placed in the center of the stage with the spotlight of public attention focused on it. It follows naturally that school boards and school administrators have, too, because of their key positions.

The new Elementary and Secondary Education Act will without doubt cause a shift in the center of gravity in the control and operation of our educational system. Any adjustment to a new situation is often a frustrating and painful process. This over-all situation is not unique to the management of our public school system. Dykes stated in his thesis, "some political scientists have warned that a widening gap, created by the increasing specialization of modern society, between those who have authority to make decision and those who have the competence, knowledge, and understandings which wise administrative decisions require, presents a serious problem in every field of governmental endeavor."

The board of education is the focal point of much public pressure for two reasons. First, the schools have always been close to the people they serve. Second, the schools' closeness provides an immediate and direct line of action for individuals and groups interested in such topics as racial integration, church-state relationships, negotiation efforts by either unions or professional organizations, and many other social or cultural concerns.

The manner in which a school board fulfills its responsibility is dependent on how its members view those responsibilities. Shall it be simply a reflector of public opinion and respond to each and every pressure exerted by the community? Or shall it be a board that charts its own course and exerts its own leadership with little reference to the will of the people in the community? There are merits to be found in each approach and likewise there are numerous faults in store for the board that follows but one course. The solution lies in the "politic" and "polite" combination of listening and leading. The words of Edmund Burke, speaking to the electors of Bristol in 1774, can provide a good guideline for today's board of education member--"Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Since we are today exploring the perceptions of school board members in the area of politics in education in the large cities, I believe we should hear from the board members.

A few weeks ago, I sent a questionnaire to the presidents of several large city boards of education seeking their reactions to various issues and problems.

I will not, of course, identify their individual responses since they were given in confidence, but I do believe that some of their selected observations are worth sharing with you.

It is difficult to draw any hard conclusions from these limited responses. Perhaps a study in greater depth could prove useful in probing the effect of "politics" and "pressures" on boards and board members. It is evident that school board members are feeling the pressures of citizens and citizen groups who are calling for action relating to racial and other problems. One board member put it this way: "This pressure has created a new sensitivity to groups which previously were not considered by the board to be pressure groups. Relationship between the power of these groups and their political effectiveness is not lost on the school board member."

In probing for answers as to the personal problems which board members face because of pressures, it was reported that some board members have had serious threats made on their lives and much personal inconvenience from publicity and demonstrations. Some reported that there is an adverse effect on the personal income of the board member that makes it difficult to get qualified people to serve on the board. On the other hand, another board member expressed the firm belief that in his city conscienscious, thoughtful, well-qualified citizens were making themselves available to serve on the board of education. It is interesting to note that in the latter case, he attributed this to the success which the school board was experiencing in solving the problems of the schools. He related that "in our schools we started several years ago to involve citizens and citizen groups. We have placed the problems of the schools out on the table, and have not tried to sweep them under the rug. We talk about them and try to do something about them." Further, they have involved citizens formally on ad hoc committees having given the committee carte blanche to identify the problem, study it and make recommendations. In this case the board had, I believe, wisely taken the precaution in appointing the committees to make sure that they were broadly representative of the community. It was reported that the recommendations which the committee developed were largely acceptable to the board. However, it was pointed out that not all of the recommendations of the citizens' committees were adopted by the board of education.

We asked the board members whether they would find merit in Dr. Conant's suggestion that large city systems might be more effectively administered if the system were broken down into smaller administrative units, each with its own board of education. None of the board members felt that this kind of action would help in solving the large city schools' problems. In fact, they said it would probably multiply them rather than help solve them. It was felt that it was necessary to develop unified, comprehensive programs to meet the problems of the city. One board member in his reply, pointed out that the solution to the administrative question is to be found in the employment of the right kind of administrative leadership. The chief administrative officer of the board in the large city, he said, needs to be one which can coordinate the efforts of large numbers of people and get things done. The oneness of the system, he said, is important.

From this very limited search for information and my less structured conversations with other board members across the country, I believe that there is an awakening and a new alertness on the part of boards of education to their authority and responsibility. The public reaction to education problems has made boards more responsive to their role.

Many observers of the changes now taking place in the large cities recognize that even though there still remains much political power, there has been a noticeable exodus to the suburbs of people who have traditionally exerted leadership. However, new political alignments are developing. Schinnerer said, "in some cities, it is difficult to get a person of established quality to be a candidate for the board of education and take all the gaff that goes with running for a public office."

Added dimension and perspective is given to our discussion by looking briefly at the municipal government of a large city. In a recent syndicated column titled, "Political Decline in New York City," Raymond Moley says:

> . . . the City of New York has grown so big, so conglomerate and so complex in its governmental problems that it is impossible to govern it from one center, even though certain of the functions of administration are delegated to the boroughs.

Fred Hechinger, Education Editor of the New York Times, raises some important questions in an article appearing in the April 17, 1965 issue of the Saturday Review. In "Who Runs Our Big City Schools?" he asks "whether the big-city superintendency has become impossible? Is the entire machinery obsolete for urban areas? Are conflicts between the superintendent and the board inevitable and beyond ultimate hope of settlement?" These are indeed searching and vital questions.

One of the things that makes the task of both the superintendent and the board of education so difficult in the large city is the many myths connected to the management of these systems. Large city systems are faced with situations or problems that are, at best, difficult to solve even if the boards had overall authority. Many proposed solutions to problems require money--sometimes large expenditures. The powers of the city's fiscal agencies or Planning Commissions mean that, in actual practice, it is often some body other than the school board which determines what funds are available, when the funds can be used by school authorities, and the actual pace at which needed improvements can occur. What must be realized and understood is the fact that decisions of any governing body, school board or municipal organization cannot be limited to solely fiscal or non-educational matters. Every decision made has direct implications for the educational programs of a community.

The system of American Education is deeply involved in all of the major issues of social change today. Education is a priority instrument whether educators themselves are in the thick of the battle or sitting on the sidelines watching the changes take place.

Heckinger contends that "it is absurd to suggest that superintendent and board can remain an independent professional principality." He continues, "The choice is largely one between (1) making the schools the end of the line of society's and the politician's buck-passing, as a consequence of sheltered independence; or (2) insisting on being part of the policy-making and money-allocating councils and bargaining chambers in which municipal power is anchored."

The task of a board of education is greater than the establishment of policy. I believe that most, if not all, of the boards' responsibilities can be classified under three areas: (1) to clarify goals, establish policies, determine priorities and lay out guidelines for the operation of the school system--with the administrator's help; (2) to provide for the needed staff, buildings, equipment and supplies necessary to accomplish the goals and objectives; and, (3) to evaluate the quality of the educational services rendered to the community.

Within this context, school boards and their superintendents should expect to find themselves buffeted by the pressures and political forces which provide the means of a free society to express itself. The board should be free, however, to weigh the many proposals (often contradictory proposals) and add other alternatives before making its decisions. It should not be forced to make decisions which in the informed judgment of the board and administration are not in the long-range best interests of the youth of our communities. In order to accomplish this, boards need to harness the constructive efforts of many individuals and groups. The board needs to have real authority over the matters for which it is held responsible.

Permit me to suggest some possible areas in which research might be profitable. I am using the term research in its broad sense.

* A study of effective ways and means for assisting boards of education to utilize the services and professional knowledge of groups and organizations in the community, whether they be directly related to education or not.
* A study of methods directed at the selection of qualified members of a board of education.

* The role that written policy statements have in the effective and efficient operation of large city schools.

* The differentiation (or fusion) of policy and administration.

* Study of a procedure whereby the voice of education will be heard.

* Study and development of materials and methods of presentation which can and will be used by board members for their own in-service training.

The National School Boards Association is interested in new information which may assist board members to be more effective. We are eager to lend any assistance we can in cooperating with you or assisting you in carrying out research, disseminating useful findings and making productive use of appropriate recommendations.

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE AND BUDGETARY DECISION-MAKING IN LARGE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS

H. Thomas James
Professor of Education
Stanford University

The politics of education was discussed seriously and with competence three years ago by Stephen Bailey and his colleagues.[1] Since then, in the dreary way we have with good ideas, we have made the term a cliche. "The Politics of Education" has become such often-warmed-over-cabbage that some of our more persistent patrons of conferences on educational administration are beginning to retch quietly at the mere mention of the term. Some of the more muddle-headed generalizations about the politics of education that are now current as a result of the interest aroused by the Syracuse study are obscuring the obvious and simple truth that Bailey and his colleagues sought to illuminate. That truth I find no better way to state than in the words used by the authors in their preface:

> "Public education in the United States is supported by all three levels of government: local, state, and federal. Most of this support comes from local property taxes. But in recent decades an increasing amount of support has come from state governments in the form of both categorical aid and general aid. General aid is distributed to local school districts on the basis of formulae which vary substantially from state to state, but which, in general, are designed to insure that children enjoy an education of at least minimum standards no matter where they live. The nature of these formulae and the amounts spent under them are products of political conflict and resolution. If state aid to education is to continue at its present rate, or is to expand, it will be because politically active schoolmen have the knowledge and skill to marshal effective political power.

---

[1] Stephen K. Bailey, et al., Schoolmen and Politics, Syracuse, 1962.

"The lesson of this essay is as simple as that."

What the Syracuse group said about the support of education in the United States of course holds true generally for public education in the large cities of the United States.

Bailey's statement that "most of this support comes from local property taxes" is true for the United States, as a whole, and for most of the states. It is also true in all cities with 100,000 or more population, except six: Birmingham, Alabama; Fresno, California; El Paso and San Antonio, Texas; Tacoma, Washington; and Washington, D. C.

Furthermore, we have noted a substantial tendency for dependence on property tax to increase with the size of districts. Analysis of a five-thousand district sample reveals that districts under 35,000 ADA average 59 percent of their revenue from local sources, while districts in a sample of about half the districts larger than 35,000 get 71 percent of their revenue from local sources. In fifteen of the very largest cities the percentage from local sources averages a little more.

Politics was defined by Bailey and his colleagues as "the fashioning of coalitions of influence in an attempt to determine what values will be authoritatively implemented in government." They proceeded to analyze how such coalitions were fashioned in New England states in attempts to determine the levels of state support for schools. I emphasize the point that they focused their attention on state support, and therefore upon efforts to influence legislative decisions. I will add nothing to their analysis in this area, but have chosen to discuss in this paper some of the attempts to influence two other sets of decisions usually made locally, one having to do with the allocations of that part of school revenues (usually, as I have noted, the larger part) that come from local sources; and the other having to do with that set of decisions governing the distribution of revenues to satisfy the demands for salaries, and for goods and services. Both sets of decisions are, at least formally and officially, made by boards of education.

The comments I will make are based largely on work now in progress at Stanford under my direction; we are analyzing the processes surrounding fiscal decisions for education in large cities of the United States.[2]

More specifically, we are trying to increase our understanding of the budget processes and the rules that govern them. In following the school budget cycle in these large cities, we are noting the efforts to influence board decisions, and are attempting to describe how these efforts are exerted on the board and the degrees of freedom for board action in responding to these pressures.

We began by assuming that the power of local boards derives from two prime sources: (1) its delegated authority to draw on tax money, within limits set by the state; and (2) its delegated authority to make rules, within limits set by the state that have the effect of law within the system. Within these two sets, the power to allocate from local resources and the power to distribute all resources allocated to school purposes are the specific powers of interest to us in our current study. In both instances the board is authorized to invoke the power of the state to enforce its will.

A crucial use of board power is exemplified in the development of the annual budget, for this instrument specifies the amount of tax money to be made available from local sources and establishes the rules as to how all income shall be distributed within the system.

As districts become larger and more bureaucratic, budget-making becomes complicated, requiring extensive study of a wide range of information, usually much more information than can be examined in meetings of the board of education. Expert attention must be brought to bear on this task over long periods of time, and the expertise required is within the school bureaucracy; more specifically, it is within a highly differentiated subsystem of that bureaucracy about which I will have more to say later in this paper. Consequently, a substantial part of the control of the budget process is transferred out of the hands of the board and into the bureaucracy itself. Decisions on how resources are to be distributed are made internally, and the board often is unable to distinguish from the information it gets from the system between allocations that will improve services and allocations that will improve staff benefits.

---

[2] Studies of the determinants of educational expenditures in the large city school systems, supported by the U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2389, Contract OE 4-10-076 (in progress, to be reported March 31, 1966).

Taxpayers' groups in large cities counter the growing power of the school bureaucracy by developing their own professional research staffs. They may bring their findings to public hearings, but often they find more effective ways of focusing attention on their conclusions, sometimes through the public press, or through various organizations outside the governmental structure, or through the municipal government system, which, even though the district is fiscally independent, can often act to limit the access of school boards to local revenues by reducing assessments in relation to actual values of property.

We have found it useful to distinguish among three kinds of pressures that appear to dominate the budget process. One is generated by the clientele of the school, the parents seeking improvement and extension of the services of the school, and this pressure works to increase expenditures. The second is generated by the personnel of the school seeking to improve the conditions of work and staff benefits. While this set of pressures also works to increase expenditures, it is to some degree independent of the first because increases in staff benefits do not necessarily improve or increase services to the clientele of the school. The third set of pressures is generated by those less interested in services, or staff benefits, and more interested in reducing taxes. In contrast to the first two, this third variety of pressures tends to reduce expenditures, but, as I have noted earlier, this set is less likely to be visible in budget hearings of the board. The result of these opposing pressures is that the principal function of the board in the budget process is to balance conflicting pressures placed upon it.

There are, of course, other constraints on the freedom of the board to select among alternative courses of action in making their decisions.

The accumulation of federal, state and local rules and rulings limit the alternatives available to those involved in the management of all public schools. Court decisions on rights of property and on human rights, legislative mandates and municipal police powers all take precedence and consequently reduce the leeway for school decisions. Perhaps as constraining, though not nearly so visible, is the tendency in larger systems for our growing school bureaucracies to build crusts of custom over established patterns of behavior, and to rigidify structural arrangements, thus slowing the functioning of the institution despite the efforts of adroit school board members or administrators.

The alternatives for action are further reduced by prevailing social and economic conditions. In studying over 100 of the nation's largest school systems I find approximately 70 percent of the variance in expenditures explained by measures of economic conditions reflecting ability to support education and measures of social conditions reflecting demands for educational services. These findings suggest that the financial resources of a community and the quality of its population set boundaries beyond which even the most enthusiastic and efficient management cannot expect to move under existing arrangements.

In a recent paper prepared for the White House Conference on Education[3] I proposed five classes of individuals that appear to me to be worthy of separate consideration for studying the politics of resource allocation and distribution in schools. My proposal was tentative and without claims that they are either mutually exclusive or exhaustive; I argued only that they appear to me to be useful for some preliminary analyses of these processes. I argued further that each group has power and influence in the fiscal processes of urban schools; that they can be distinguished by differences in the sources of their power and the channels through which their influence is communicated; and that they differ also in the frames of reference through which they view educational issues. They are (1) the nominal decision-makers, members of local boards of education who draw their power directly from the state through their legitimate demands on resources and their rule-making powers, with the power of the state available for enforcement of both; (2) the clientele of the school who typically orient to services of the school; (3) the professional educational administrators who are being driven increasingly from their preferred mediating role between board and staff to closer alignment with the board; (4) the instructional staff, increasingly militant in its demands for improved conditions of employment; and (5) the service personnel, which we find rather generally aligned with the systems of power and influence imbedded in municipal politics.

---

[3] "Can Urban Schools Be Managed?" Consultants' Papers, The White House Conference on Education, Vol. II. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1965; pp. 151-158.

I will deal in this paper only with two of these categories, the board and the service personnel; for any of you who may wish to pursue the subject I refer you to the White House paper, or to the report that will be issued next March.

The first category, members of governing boards, would appear at first glance to wield the greatest power and influence in school fiscal decisions, because they represent a direct extension of the plenary power of the state. They have either the direct access to renewable resources through the power to tax, or they have a state-mandated claim on taxes levied by municipal government. In addition, they have rule-making authority delegated by the state, and their rules have the force of law within the system. Actually, however, increasingly detailed rules for schools are being written by state legislatures, on the one hand, which in effect abrogate the rule-making power of local boards in any area affected, and thereby return to the legislature authority once delegated to boards. On the other hand, the rule-making power of local boards is further abrogated by professional associations of teachers through negotiated terms and conditions of employment. Similarly, municipal governments often exert important controls over selection of the board and over budgets in fiscally dependent school systems. For example, through control of assessments of property in most school systems in conjunction with the limitations on levy rates established by legislation in most cities (often more restrictive than in other districts). These governments sharply restrict board access to local resources. Thus, boards of education must be viewed in relation to city and state officials to determine whether the power they wield is real; more often than not we find it is ritualistic, that board members are often not free to make fiscal decisions but are in fact engaged only in enacting _forms_ of decisions, the substance of which has been settled elsewhere. Legislatures in many states have created separate bodies of law for regulating urban school systems, and in doing so have, rather than increasing the power of boards, actually eroded those powers by reducing alternatives for decision. Legislatures are continuing to expand the body of statutory law and are rapidly completing centralization in the state legislatures of the control of fiscal decisions in urban schools.

The classic view of the local board of education in the literature of school administration is that of policy-maker. The legislature specified its forms, its powers and its duties. It is a political body in the sense that it is required to make policy for the local school system and to see that policy made by the legislature is enforced. If I am correct in my contention that the legislatures are increasing their body of policy for schools (more recently, and more often at the urging of Congress or the Federal Courts) and thereby decreasing the role of the board in policy-making, then we may expect to see boards of education increasingly engaged in mediating the terms under which universalistic policy is applied in the local system, and less involved with the formulation of policy. If this be so, then some additional urgency attends the present efforts to reapportion state legislatures and--hopefully thereby--to increase the voice of legislators, who are knowledgeable about and compassionate toward the needs of the city. Rural-dominated legislatures in the past have been notably lacking in both of these qualities in most of our states.

I believe there are good and sufficient reasons why the volume of policy made by boards of education is declining, and the volume made by legislatures (often at the initiative of the Congress) is increasing. Whether board members are directly elected or appointed by representatives of the people who are politically responsible to the electorate, they respond in most of the large cities to a tradition of being non-political in the partisan sense. Thus, persons elected to boards of education rarely have occupied other political office, and ex-board members usually do not run for other political offices. The role of school board member is one of the last remaining opportunities in the political world for the "gentleman in public office." In many of the very large school systems periods of relative peace and quiet in the management of the district's affairs have in the past been characterized by high incidence of "gentlemen." Fortunately or unfortunately, "gentlemen in public office" have a marked distaste for controversy and public uproar. Usually they attempt to reduce conflict rather than to resolve its causes. Therefore, some of the most consequential educational issues of our time, because they have been the most violently controversial, have too often been sidestepped by boards of education and so have had to be resolved in the less squemish and more realistic arenas of partisan politics.

Furthermore, many boards of education are unable to resolve specific conflicts because they are deliberately structured to prevent final resolution of some issues. The classic illustration is the fixed balance of religious faiths on boards of education. (I have often wondered what the outcome would be in one of the cities maintaining such a balance if an aggrieved citizen were to press a carefully formulated suit against the appointing officer for violation of one of the common constitutional or legislative restrictions against discrimination on religious grounds.)

The processes by which boards of education are selected have important consequences on their relationships to the state, the city and the school staff. A staff under my direction is now engaged at Stanford in an analysis of these processes.[4] At the risk of pre-judging our efforts, which are continuing for at least another year, I am willing now to risk a generalization: the way boards are selected is of less consequence than is the need for public interest and concern about their functions. No method that we have found so far works well for long with an apathetic people. On the other hand, many methods, some damned for decades by professors of educational administration, seem to function reasonably well while substantial numbers of citizens are willing to inform themselves and engage in the task of making them work.

I have noted the tendency of eroding board powers as universalistic and generated at state and national levels. I would like to examine next some characteristics of operations internal to a school system which appear to be contributing further to the immobilization of boards in their function as rule-maker for distributing revenues within the system.

One of the major powers delegated to school boards by state legislatures is the development of the annual budget. Although control of the income side is fast slipping away from most boards, distributing available funds within the system is still perceived as an important function of the board. Yet here, too, I would argue that a steady erosion of power is occurring. As the state has assumed greater control over revenues, or allowed municipalities to assume it, so the state also has reduced board control of internal distribution of revenues by a growing body of state regulations, mandated services, categorical aids, salary schedules, tenure provisions and other staff benefits. Whether the general decline of boards as prime movers in the management of schools should be allowed to continue is arguable; increasingly efficient state and federal bureaucracies are perhaps laying more rationale bases for many of these kinds of decisions than boards now generate, and perhaps this trend should be encouraged; if not, where and how we begin to stem the tide that appears now to be running strongly against boards is a most perplexing problem.

---

[4] Supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

The second major reference group of the five I mentioned earlier is a part of the school bureaucracy but sharply differentiated from the administrative and the instructional staffs; it is composed of the service personnel in the school system. On the lower end of the status hierarchy, these persons engage in maintenance and operation of the plant and serve the instructional staff and pupils; at upper status levels, they negotiate the contracts for building, for buying, selling and leasing land, and for acquiring equipment and supplies used by the schools. They also often explore and negotiate with the municipal political system to determine the tax loads that will be tolerated, and they often engage in negotiations for funds to be allocated to the school by the legislature and the Congress.

The superintendent rarely gains control of this subsystem. More often, control lies in the hands of the assistant superintendent for business, the secretary of the board, or the school business manager, few of whom in the past have been professional educators.

Often its head is one of the "two-headed monsters," in which a superintendent and a business manager report independently to the board. In spite of all the arguments against this form, which also is often damned in the professional literature of school administration, it persists legally in many city school systems today, and it persists in fact in many other city school systems even though officially abandoned. The reasons for this persistence are complex, and there are more arguments favoring its persistence than are generally specified in the literature of school administration. A part of the explanation lies in a cleavage in the administrative line between superintendents oriented to national professional norms and business managers oriented to local political norms. An emergent group of business managers is developing a set of national norms for professional behavior, but a traditional group still conforms to norms prescribed by the local political system.

A new type of professional school business manager is emerging in some systems, and a national association of school business managers has been active for more than a decade in promoting professionalization. But where these subsystems are powerful factors in the management of school affairs they usually have close ties to the municipal political systems. And in view of the historic difficulties encountered by the teaching profession in gaining their autonomy, I am skeptical that full-fledged professional status for the business manager is likely to be achieved soon without more attention from state legislatures than we have observed in most states to date. Furthermore, its achievement may simply mark a further shift in the locus of decision from school boards to the municipality. The issue I see here is whether it is possible and desirable to dislodge the management of the strictly business aspects of school affairs from its generally extensive involvement with the municipal political system. Alternatives are (1) to make it an entirely autonomous unit within the school bureaucracy and regulate it so thoroughly as to assure its independence from municipal politics (which seems to have been accomplished by a few cities); (2) to shift it entirely to the municipal bureaucracy (as some cities and many counties have done in law or in fact); or (3) to give it entirely to the state bureaucracy (which a few states already have done in part or in whole, and which many others could do with little loss in autonomy of local units and probably with great gains in efficiency). I doubt that many of the existing arrangements can survive unchanged as the federal fiscal agents begin the task of tracing the flow of the rising tide of federal funds to schools.

Let me, in closing, try one final generalization. The efforts of the past century to "keep politics out of the schools" appear now to have borne strange and unintended fruit, for the result of these efforts appear to be that the significant decisions about the public schools are now being made elsewhere than in the boards of education created to make those decisions.

A SUPERINTENDENT VIEWS THE RACIAL PROBLEMS CONFRONTING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Carroll F. Johnson
Superintendent of Schools, White Plains, New York
Chairman, AASA Special Committee on School Racial Policy

I administer the schools in a city of slightly over 50,000 people. Seventeen percent of our school population is Negro. Our school system has made several innovations--involving far reaching policy decisions--in an effort to improve integration. Perhaps a few comments on our experimentation might be interesting, even helpful, to this group in spite of the fact that your area of concern is large city schools whose problems vary not only from those of my system but undoubtedly from each other. Further, you might be interested in hearing about problems and progress of the AASA Committee on School Racial Problems. However, before reviewing such events and details, I think I should offer a frame of reference for my observations.

The phrase "frame of reference" is an interesting one and especially in this racial context. We all view every scene and every event through the "frame" of our own experience. Indeed, as Tenneson wrote in "Ulysses", "All experience is an arch." This arch frames and is part of our overview. If we are objective enough to admit that such arches or frames of experience and philosophy circumscribe our view, a fair appraisal of racial attitudes demands that we examine, at least briefly, the viewer.

Mark Twain once remarked about the enviable state of mind in which a man approaches a hand of poker when he's sitting there with four aces. Most school administrators in this country started their careers with most, if not all, of the cultural aces--most were white, had good educations, came from environments of some cultural influence, and had a few influential friends or even mentors to guide their budding careers. From what vantage point does such a fellow view a challenger who, from the moment he picks up his hand, knows not that his chances are poor but that he isn't even in the game? Many Americans who hold some of the aces would rather not consider the plight of the player who can't even stay in the game. I have tried, hard, to put myself vicariously in the position of the low man on the totem pole in order to understand the racial problem. My most recent attempt lay in reading "Black Like Me." The author, John Howard Griffin, darkened his skin and set out to discover what it was like to be a Negro in the deep South from October 28, 1959, through August 17, 1960. Perhaps the most startling thing remaining with me from "Black Like Me" was not the cruelty that Griffin endured but the time a Negro spends (I wish I could now say spent--past tense) searching for the simple necessities of life. I quote from his book:

> "Again an important part of my daily life was spent searching for the basic things that all whites take for granted: a place to eat, or somewhere to find a drink of water, a rest room, somewhere to wash my hands. More than once I walked into drug stores where a Negro can buy cigarettes or anything else except soda fountain service. I asked politely where I might find a glass of water. Though they had water not three yards away, they carefully directed me to the nearest Negro cafe. Had I asked outright for a drink, they would perhaps have given it. But I never asked. The Negro dreads rejection, and I waited for them to offer the drink. Not one ever did. No matter where you are, the nearest Negro cafe is always far away, it seems. I learned to eat a great deal when it was available and convenient, because it might not be available or convenient when the belly next indicated its hunger. I've been told that many distinguished Negroes whose careers have brought them South encounter similar difficulties. All the honors in the world cannot buy them a cup of coffee in the lowest, greasy-spoon joint. It is not that they crave service in the white man's cafe over their own--it is simply that in many sparsely settled areas Negro cafes do not exist; and even in densely settled areas one must sometimes cross town for a glass of water. It is rankling, too, to be encouraged to buy all of one's goods in white stores and then be refused soda fountain or restroom services."

I think many of us are trying to see the Negro integration problem from the Negro's side. However, I think most of us don't really move that arch or frame of reference enough. There is a tendency in all of us to stick to the patterns of behavior and approaches that we first thought, years ago, would help us not only to get along in this world but to do good work. Habits of thought are hard to change --especially for school administrators. I am reminded of the old superintendent's prayer: "Lord, help me to make wise decisions, because you know how hard it is for me to change my mind."

I have set up four arbitrary groups into which most of us seem to fall on the racial issue. I suggest that these offer a rough approximation of the general arches of experience or frames of reference through which we view the racial conflicts in our schools and elsewhere.

First, there is the status quo man. Pierre Teilhard De Chardin, a French priest of the Society of Jesus who worked in China for many years and played a major role in the discovery of Peking man, wrote some cogent words on those who stand for the status quo. In his book "The Future of Man," he called such persons "immobilists." They have, he wrote, "Common sense on their side, habit of thought, inertia, pessimism and, to some extent, morality and religion. Nothing, they argue, appears to have changed since man began to hand down the memory of the past . . . to effect change is to undermine the traditional order whereby the distress of living creatures was reduced to a minimum. What innovator has not retapped the springs of blood and tears? For the sake of human tranquility, in the name of fact, and in defense of the sacred established order the immobilists forbid the earth to move."

A second kind of person one encounters in today's turmoil of integration is the idealist. Often he burns with religious or ethical zeal; he often wants economic and social changes effected not now, but yesterday! Sometimes he lunges at molehills and mountains with equal vigor, but he does shake the complacency of many and induce some community leaders to reassess problems--even if only to try to devise arguments to back their cherished traditions.

A third possible grouping of people, for the sake of my argument, I shall call the men of vague good will. They wish everyone well, and they have a righteous tradition of tending to their own business. In individual hardship cases they hasten to cross town with baskets of food, and they often are photographed working for the community chest or united fund. About wholesale economic or social disorder, they just don't know what to do, so they do nothing. They believe that those with the will to do so can solve their own economic and social problems through the private enterprize system in our American "land of opportunity." They can't put their finger on the heart of local or national problems, often because they don't know how to or don't try to get all the facts. They see several sides to problems and are often experienced enough to take pause at Teilhard De Chardin's sentence: "What innovator has not retapped the springs of blood and tears?" (Let me remark here that I sympathize and perhaps empathize with this hesitancy.) Cautious people who have watched the unfolding process of an innovation have observed that there is a curious geometric progression about problems arising from solved problems. A solution to one problem often leads to two new problems, unforeseen and just as serious. Dealing with a succession of problems spawned by solutions is discouraging, to say the least, and can be frightening. So men of vague good will do a good turn here and there, and hope. Perhaps they hope for "peace in their time."

I like to think of myself in a fourth category, that of the realist. I would like to think that I am a practical man of action. This fourth grouping, I am confident, includes the participants at this conference. Those in this category must have ideals to guide them as they tack and jibe their indirect way to compromises in an uncharted sea. But they try to act on carefully amassed facts, and they try to know the temper of the people they seek to influence. It is essential to know, to sense, what innovations can and cannot be made and when they cannot be made at all.

Let me illustrate. In 1964, White Plains closed a predominantly Negro school and began transporting under-privileged youngsters in a radial pattern to schools out of the heart of town. It is my belief that the poeple of my community would not have accepted very graciously reverse bussing (white children to Negro schools). I do not believe that we could have bussed into a predominantly Negro school children from outlying or privileged areas without major protest. Most citizens accepted the idea that they would offer under-privileged children more; they would not have so readily accepted the concept of offering their children less by sending them to leaven the lot of under-privileged youth. Further, I don't believe that the school could have been closed three years earlier. "There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune."

Practical people try to be ready for the tide. Commissioner Keppel has expressed much of this idea when he said, "Thank God, for the Civil Rights Movement." This movement, and the pressures therefrom, have made it possible for many of us to take steps that we have known in our hearts should have been taken years ago. Idealists may scoff at such a position. Idealists are not likely to think much of Alexander Pope's lines: "Be not the first by whom the new are tried, not yet the last to lay the old aside." They don't have a high regard for compromise or even for tactics.

However, it often seems to me that fire-brand zealots, status quo immobilists, and the what-on-earth-can-I-do men of vague good will waste much of their energies arguing with or denouncing each other. Sometimes there is a long era of stalemate. Meanwhile, "whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores." Millions of Negroes are now belligerent. Something is gaining on us. Do you remember Satchel Paige's rules for living, set down many years ago? I will quote even the irrelevant ones, since I enjoy them and think you may.

1. Avoid fried meats which angry up the blood.
2. If your stomach disputes you, let down, pacify it with cool thoughts.
3. Keep the juices flowing by jogging around quietly as you move.
4. Go very lightly on vice such as carrying on in society. The social ramble

ain't restful.

5. Avoid running at all times.
6. Don't look back--something might be gaining on you.

Something is gaining on us--The Negro problem. I say this in spite of some impressive statistics given by Whitney M. Young, Jr. at the U. S. Conference of Mayors in May, 1965. He noted that between the Civil War and the Korean War, the Negro made a "magnificent" gain in literacy: from over 90% illiterate to 5%. He noted that 3.5% of non-whites today hold college degrees as compared to 8% among whites. As he says, this is a tremendous stride. He noted that economically Negroes have been pulling themselves up "by their bootstraps." For example, he cites the numbers of non-whites who have joined the ranks of those making over $4,000 a year. In Boston, in 1949, they numbered 660; in 1959, there were 9,677. In New York, the non-whites earning more than $4,000 a year rose from 11,000 to 199,000 in the same ten years. I agree with him that many Negroes have made praiseworthy strides in their private war on illiteracy and poverty. However, I am more impressed (or depressed) by statistics coming out of preliminary planning for President Johnson's Fall Conference on Negro Problems. Let me mention just a few of these facts:

Negroes accounted for one in ten of the population in 1950. In 1970, at present trends, they will acount for one in eight. Proportionately, that is a staggering population growth. Further, the government study states (I am quoting from the New York Times of July 19) that "circumstances of the Negro-American community in recent years have probably been getting worse, not better, and the gap between the Negro and most other groups in American society is widening." The study says that the fundamental problem is that of family structure, and "so long as this situation persists, the cycle of poverty and disadvantage will continue to repeat itself." Between 1940 and 1963, the illegitimacy rate among Negroes rose from 16.8% to 23.6%, while the white rate rose from 2% to 3.07%. In 1950, 14% of all Negro children were receiving aid to dependent children, compared to 2% of white children. About 56% of Negro children receive such aid at some time, compared to 8% of white children.

Now it is true that the United States public schools cannot and should not try to cope alone with gigantic national problems. However, schools can and should cooperate and supply leadership in a national effort to improve the cultural level of all youth--if not for altruistic reasons, then for selfish ones!

In White Plains, we are trying to face the facts realistically and to accept our burden of responsibility. White Plains, in September 1964, put into effect a plan to insure racial balance. This was done with a view that racial segregation, no matter what its cause, is harmful to minority and majority groups alike. The White Plains Plan provides that each elementary school shall have a minimum of ten percent and a maximum of thirty percent Negro enrollment. To insure this racial balance, it was necessary to close one predominantly Negro elementary school. We converted it to Manpower Development Training Programs and other adult usage. The students from this elementary school and some other predominantly Negro center city areas were rezoned to outlying, white schools which were either all white or almost all white. To get the children from their homes to the outlying schools, transportation was provided for any child assigned to a school farther than one and one-half miles from his home.

The Board of Education and Administrative staff met with citizens interested in bringing about more truly integrated schools at intervals for the past several years. During the winter and spring of 1963-64, these meetings became more frequent and more directly aimed at arriving at a specific solution to the problem of racial imbalance in time for the opening of school in September, 1964. Consultants were obtained to work with the Board and representative parents from the Rochambeau School--the school which enrolled a preponderance of Negroes and which was subsequently converted to adult usage. The following goals were established as a framework within which the integration efforts would take place:

1. To maintain the neighborhood school for as many children as possible.

2. To provide for only a minimum amount of change for both white and Negro pupils.
3. To establish an equitable distribution of Negro pupils in all schools.
4. To provide a plan that would insure both permanence and flexibility.

Attendance lines for all elementary schools were redrawn, resulting in reassignment of schools for 20% of the pupils. In some cases the reassignment meant the pupil was only a few blocks farther away from the school and could still walk to his school. For those being transferred to schools more than one and one-half miles away, bus transportation was provided. In 1964-65 one out of every ten pupils in the school district was taken by bus to a school outside his old district. However, no pupil had to travel more than four miles one way.

There has been wide support for the plan. The parent teachers associations, the White Plains Teachers Association, the Ministerial Association, the Urban League, the NAACP, the Junior Chamber of Commerce and other groups have lent their official support. When six parents sought to block the plan, most of the above organizations, plus interested citizens, entered the case as Amicus Curiae. State Supreme Court Justice De Forrest C. Pitt ruled in favor of the plan, stating that the Board had not been "arbitrary or capricious."

To determine how teachers felt about the plan, we sent to all elementary teachers an open ended questionnaire which we asked the teachers not to sign. About half of the elementary teachers provided answers. Of this number, about 86% approved the program. Of the remaining 14%, about half completely disapproved, and about half had reservations. One teacher who did not like the plan said that it was "not a success socially or intellectually." Another felt that little integration had been achieved when the pupils were on their own--in the lunchroom and on the playground. However, a diametrically different position was taken by a teacher who wrote: "Teachers who have never taught educationally disadvantaged children before have achieved some remarkable results with children who come to them with serious learning or behavior difficulties. It will be a long time before we can assess the effects of the plan for all our children, but the enhanced learning experiences of the staff cannot be overlooked."

In my own evaluation of the plan, I would be the most hesitant to describe it as unqualified success. However, I do believe we have made a sound beginning. We have established a foundation upon which, with hard work, we may in the future succeed in achieving a significant measure of real integration. Furthermore, I would be the first to admit that an approach to our problem in a relatively small city and with a relatively small percentage of Negro students (about 20%--elementary schools) may offer little to the great cities of our country--great cities with problems to match.

Our AASA Special Committee on School Racial Policy was appointed in August, 1963. We have held three meetings--two two-day meetings and a relatively brief session in connection with our 1965 AASA meeting. From these three meetings over a period of almost two years, we do not have in written form a great deal to show for our efforts. The consensus of our Committee at the conclusion of our first meeting in August, 1964 was that changes in the legal, social, and economic aspects of the problem of racial integration were so rapid that guidelines would be outdated before they could be produced. However, we agreed that our committee should sponsor a resolution to be presented at our annual meeting in February, 1965. We also believed that we should continue our existence with the view to producing a publication on or about February, 1966. This is our present goal, and progress was made toward that goal at our recent May 7-9 meeting here in Chicago.

Miss Terry Ferrer, the respected, capable, education editor of the New York Herald Tribune, on February 21, 1965, following our annual AASA meeting, accused us of taking too seriously Satchel Paige's Rule No. 5 "avoid running at all times." As a matter of fact, she headed her article, "The Tiptoers and the Marchers." I don't believe she meant that we were the marchers. She ended her article: "The tiptoeing was very loud here last week." Roy Wilkins, the highly regarded executive director of the NAACP, at our opening AASA meeting, stated that "the school establishment" was the "prime obstacle to changes which give promise of eliminating _de facto_ segregation" and that "the people who run the schools are dragging their feet." Other civil rights leaders have been even less charitable in their description of our leadership role.

I would like to offer some views that may have relevance to any of the administrators present at this workshop. Before offering these premises, I would like to say that they are not necessarily the views of the AASA Committee on Racial Policy.

First view--Each community is different and even similar communities have more differences than they have similarities. Solutions and approaches which will work in one community might be totally unacceptable in another place.

Second view--Social, economic, and legal changes in the area of race relations are so rapid that an entirely acceptable solution today may be one which would have been entirely unacceptable two years ago. Consequently, had our AASA Committee promptly established guidelines in 1963, immediately after its appointment, I am quite confident that those guidelines would be something all of us here would be quick to disown on August 2, 1965.

Third view--the chief school administrator and the board of education must convince the Negro community and the Civil Rights groups of their sincere desire to integrate the schools, of their belief in integration, and of their own good faith. Once convinced of that good faith, supported by action, I believe that a reasonable degree of patience may be expected.

Fourth view--Civil Rights groups and the Negro community should be taken into the confidence of the administration and the board. There should be honest, open discussion of various approaches to integration. When this is done and the people most interested in integration are aware of the steps being taken, the research being carried out, the plans being analyzed, and when they have tangible evidence of work going on, a more cooperative attitude may be expected.

Fifth view--the press should be kept as well informed as possible. They should know about proposals under way, research being carried out, and plans which are being advanced or rejected.

Sixth view--the board of education and superintendent of schools must exhibit to the community unity of purpose. There should be no question about the confidence of the board of education in the superintendent of schools. Likewise, the superintendent of schools must demonstrate confidence in the board of education. The result of divisiveness between the board and the superintendent is chaos.

Seventh view--once the board of education and the superintendent of schools have jointly determined a proper and sound plan for integration, this plan should be approached with courage and determination. A great many attacks are made on excellent plans because those who do not like the plans feel that a strong attack will discourage the proponents; frequently, this is the result. However, if the board of education at every opportunity presents a united front and indicates an unwaivering determination to move ahead, the opposition is frequently discouraged.

My remarks have been based upon the premise that we accept racial integration as necessary. Segregation, intentional or unintentional, de facto or de jure, is harmful to both the Negro and the white child. With this premise, I have discussed one superintendent's approaches to the problem of how to integrate most effectively. In this country, as in my community, I believe that we now have a foundation and a climate upon which we, as school administrators, may contribute substantially not only to educational improvement but to alleviating cultural inequities. We are in a position to contribute toward the attainment of that equality envisioned by Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg over 100 years ago.

RACIAL ISSUES
CONFRONTING LARGE CITY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Charles E. Stewart
Director Teacher Education
Detroit Public Schools

INTRODUCTION

I was asked to address this discussion to the question of "Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators." It is a topic designed to catch the wary eyes of battle-scarred, big-city school people. For, in our large cities most of the current crucial issues have apparent racial overtones.

I am mindful, however, that preceding presentations at this Seminar have directed your thinking toward the broader problems of the educational enterprise in a society undergoing a dramatic social revolution. In the kaleidoscope of human and technological events which characterize that revolution, those problems which we call "racial" are but one aspect of the total pattern of change.

That fact has been obscured too often by interpretations of social issues as racial issues. Such interpretations frequently have limited educational thinking and planning to techniques of defense, conciliation and compromise. Decisions rooted in these expediencies more often than not have impinged only on the outer framework of the educational structure rather than its core processes. The resulting educational arrangements for children have not always been broadly productive.

Few would disagree with the premise that schools exist to serve the needs, the ideals and the aspirations of American Democracy. Or, as Miller and Spaulding put it, "the schools serve continuously as an agency by which society examines itself and redirects itself in terms of what it determines to be good." How well the schools serve in that capacity, of course, must necessarily depend on how effectively they can assess the constantly evolving nature of societal needs, ideals and aspirations; and how creatively they can "gear up" for any educational changes which may be dictated by that assessment. It is hoped that this paper will provide guidelines in those two dimensions of concern by

1. Exploring some myths about the "Negro Community"
2. Examining some clues to what lies ahead in our large cities.
3. Suggesting some "offensive" strategies for schools.

While this is not a scholarly paper in the strict sense of the word, much effort was given to "testing" the perceptions it embodies with responsible observers of the current scene. Members of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, Organized labor, and Civil Rights Agencies were helpful in this respect.

Especially valued were consultations with Longworth Quinn, Managing Editor of the Michigan Chronicle, Horace Sheffield of the U.A.W.--C.I.O., Ofield Dukes of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity, Arthur Johnson, Deputy Director of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission and William Miller, Deputy Superintendent of the Wayne County, Michigan Intermediate School District.

THE NEGRO COMMUNITY

Recently a school administrator, a veteran of more than thirty successful years in the business, threw up his hands in frustration exclaiming, "I don't know what's happening any more! Time was when I knew the Negro Community well--knew its leaders personally; they were my personal friends. But now it seems like there is a new 'leader' popping up every day and I find it difficult to understand what they want . . . ."

His dilemma emphasizes the first point to be made: There is no such thing as a "Negro Community"--at least not of the undifferentiated, monolithic order which his perceptions have created for him. But school Administrators attempt to deal with it as if it were. This is not to deny either the existence or the strength of common bonds among Negroes. A common desire for freedom from injustice and a common inability individually to do much about fulfilling that desire have made figurative bedfellows out of many otherwise disinclined Negroes. To that extent and in that sense only can we use the term Negro Community.

This issue of ethnic identification was pointed up long ago by Frazier (Black Bourgeosie). While Frazier may have been a bit unfair in his generalization about the motivations of "upper-class" Negroes, it is impossible to deny some resentment against the Negro masses who loom as a barrier to their social mobility. Similarly, in a more recent study, upper class Negro respondents more frequently than lower class tended to disassociate themselves from ethnic identification in situations where the racial referent was deemed unfavorable.

The illusion of a unified Negro Community with an understanding and cooperative leadership is rooted in an era when Negroes could not, or dared not without permission, be articulate about their needs and aspirations. It grew strong by virtue of the limited channels for communicating between whites and Negroes. It is difficult now to say whether this comforting illusion was created by white people or for them.

A second point of importance to school people is that the human differences which exist within the so-called Negro Community are not easily classified. Class and status lines are less clearly drawn and not easily equated with those of the white community. What a Negro does for a living, for example, is not always a reliable clue to his real or perceived status in the Negro Community. This can be illustrated within the school organization itself.

In the Negro Community the teacher historically has enjoyed a somewhat higher social status than that of the white teacher in the general community. Important also, though operative in a lesser degree, is the fact of the quasi-professional status of the Negro secretary. She often has a civic-minded husband, or is herself active in community organizations. Operating as she does at the very heart of the school enterprise, she is literally forced to observe and develop negative or positive feelings about it. The Negro school secretary, more often than her white counterpart, is in position to translate her feelings into organizational images which may or may not be helpful to the schools.

The Human Relations Department of a school system recently received a bitter complaint from a Negro cleaning woman in one of its schools. She explained that the principal in her building sought good human relations with his custodial staff through much jocularity punctuated now and then by a friendly though patronizing pat on the back, or the head. According to the complainant her custodial co-workers, all white, enjoyed the principal's benevolent gestures of appreciation for their important roles; she definitely did not. The principal's motives are not in question here; they undoubtedly were of the best. He treated the Negro woman as he did all other members of his custodial staff, male or female, without regard for her coler. What he did not understand was that she does not perceive herself as "only a cleaning woman." As a widow who has seen better days, she still belongs to a bridge club which includes some wives of business and professional men. Moreover, she is president of her local "block club" where, if he had ever attended, the principal would have met her on more nearly even terms as an important human being.

A third point to be emphasized is that not all Negroes who live in disadvantaged areas are themselves disadvantaged. Most neighborhoods of the Negro Community present a wide variety and range of home and family circumstances. The factor of increased mobility in housing does not alter that picture. While a growing number of Negro families are becoming "middle class" economically and in their aspirations, they still cannot easily move out of areas characterized by deprivation and neglect. By and large they can move with them but not away from them. Thus, middle class Negroes with their higher aspirations and expectations are compelled to observe the efforts of our schools in an area where we are admittedly weak--educating the "disadvantaged." Having observed our schools at their worst, they denounce them. Much of the denunciation might be avoided were school people better able to understand and deal with this range of differences.

Finally, there should be brief mention of two long-held but mistaken notions about ways of working with low status Negro parents. In the first place, contrary to what earlier sociologists taught us, they do not have a negative attitude toward education. Despite all evidence which would tend to dim their faith, low status Negro parents still believe that education is "the way out" for their children. They are not joiners. They will not willingly come to a P.T.A. meeting to see a travelogue type film or hear lectures on matters for which they feel no immediate concern. But they are interested in their children and can be reached with down-to-earth approaches which assume that interest. It goes without saying that the school's approach to parents must be one which reflects a genuine interest in their children. Too often what is interpreted as a rejection of education is more truly a rejection of the school and its personnel.

The second mistaken notion is one which grows out of learnings about group dynamics. Many a Negro parent has been enticed to the school once, never to return again because of the school's current addiction to the cult of informality. Informality and "first-name calling" are really objectives to be achieved through the growth of mutual respect, confidence and regard. They are not techniques which will be generally effective with low status parents. Mrs. Dora Jones likes to be called Mrs. Jones, not Dora. In all probability she has had enough of being just plain Dora, especially if her first name has been used to denote her subservient status. Already uncomfortable and insecure in the alien setting of the school, the low status Negro parent must be made to feel that he belongs there and is welcomed as an important human being. This cannot be done by gimmick alone.

Leadership in the Negro Community

White people often ask, "who speaks for the Negro?" The only truthful answer is no one today speaks for the Negro. If that answer is disconcerting it must be remembered that the question itself is rooted in clearly obsolete notions about the nature of the Negro Community. Actually, it is not certain that any one person ever did apeak for all Negroes. But Negroes until recent years had but a small voice in determining their spokesman. This was true primarily because the first requirement for a Negro leader was that he be acceptable to the white power structure. Even in recent years, published articles by well known Negro writers such as Lomax and Fuller have accused the mainly middle-class Negro leadership of being white "carbon copies." Congressman Adam Clayton Powell spoke to that point in his "Black Position Paper" delivered May 28, 1965 in Chicago. Powell said,

> Black communities all over America today suffer from absentee black leadership. This black leadership--the ministers, the politicians, businessmen, doctors and lawyers--must come back to the Negroes who made them in the first place or be purged by the black masses.

The Congressman called upon Negroes to reject the white community's carefully selected "Ceremonial Negro Leaders" and insist that the white community deal instead with black leadership chosen by black Communities. Mr. Powell's views on "Black Nationalism" may not be widely shared throughout the country, but his statements reflect a growing disaffection of the black masses who have not yet felt the effects of improved civil rights opportunities.

It is understandable that the present climate would be favorable to the current thrusts of many individuals and organizations to achieve leadership roles in the Negro Struggle. For in this struggle lies the largest source of power within reach of Negro leaders. Here is power which transcends the boundaries and possibilities of the Negro Community alone. It is power which affects the nation. The competitive struggle for leadership among Negroes, however, must not be viewed as a kind of tennis game. Arthur Johnson, Deputy Director of the Michigan Civil Richts Commission and a former Detroit NAACP Executive Secretary, offers this insightful observation in that regard:

> This is due in part to the basic quest among men for power, and since in the Negro Community the greatest source of power is within the Negro struggle, there is fierce competition among men of talent and strength for these positions of power. It also meets a deep emotional need within the Negro community. Throughout our history white men of talent and skill have been free to compete for the great fortunes of business, industry and governmental leadership. Negroes have been restricted in this exercise of personal determination and ambition. They now seek and are realizing some of the personal and public rewards of great and powerful positions of leadership.
> (Emphasis is mine)

In spite of the competition, however, it must be stated that Negro leadership is far more stable than seems generally recognized by the white community. It is clear that the major leadership roles are performed by the NAACCP, The Urban League, CORE and certain labor-oriented organizations. Not without significance, however, are some of the student-based groups such as The Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee and the Northern Student Movement. It is not uncommon for these organizations to join hands on a given issue. For while each tends to follow locally a pattern of action rather closely related to the philosophy of its national body, local circumstances and issues sometimes cause departures from the expected behaviors.

Daniel Thompson's study of The Negro Leadership Class (1963) provides an interesting discussion of a rationale underlying the need for different organizational approaches to questions of civil rights. Stated simply, some organizations and/or individuals meet the need for organizing and planning within the Negro Community. Others serve more effectively in the give and take process of negotiating across community lines. Putting it another way, some civil rights organizations are geared mainly to working through the community power structure, using persuasion and education. The Urban League best fits this characterization in most cities. The NAACP, on the other hand, exerts more effort and influence within the Negro Community to develop moral, economic, legal and political pressures. Using these pressures, the organization attempts to work with the power structure toward agreements based on negotiation and compromise. CORE functions in a fashion similar to NAACP but relies a bit more heavily on organizing the Negro Community for specific demonstrations of protest and pressure. The student-based organizations in the past have depended almost entirely on the moral force of protest against the power structure, but there is indication of tactical changes in the direction of more massive community organization.

The technique of building a competing power structure by mass organization of the inner-city sectors is a relative newcomer to the scene. It is especially worthy of note, however, for three reasons: First, the mass-based community organization device for the first time places poor white alongside poor Negroes in a common cause. If the technique grows in use, it will further confirm the protestations of Bayard Rustin and others that the so-called _Negro revolt_ is in truth a _social revolution_. Second, initial efforts at massive community organization by groups such as the Northern Student Movement have been narrow in scope and amateurish in design. Not so the current efforts of professional community organizers such as Saul Alinski of Chicago. Mr. Alinski already has achieved some national notice for his skill as a traveling consultant on the problems of the inner-city. Mr. Alinski's thesis is simple and requires no great knowledge or understanding of the particular city where he is consulting. _The poor are helpless in the face of the traditional community power structure. They cannot hope to solve their problems without a comparable power born of mass organization_. He organized them.

The third reason for special interest in this phenomenom is as simple as Mr. Alinski's thesis. Rightfully or not, the big-city school system is likely to be the first "whipping boy" in any massive onslaught against the power structure. It is most readily accessible: its faults are most easily observable at first hand; and its programs are least clearly defensible.

In this discussion of leadership, a special word must be said about an emerging "new breed" of middle-class Negroes. The desires and frustrations of this new breed have become more acute with the quickening pace of pressures for change both within and outside the Negro community. Both the desires and frustrations are fed by an unrelenting hope for achieving every particular of American middle class respectability and acceptance. Historically, this hope has been at once a source of strength and weakness in the Negro cause. On the one hand it is the stirrings for change generated mainly by middle class expectancies which constitute the most persistent force in the civil rights movement, and the financial contributions of middle class Negroes provide the main support for civil rights organizations, particularly the NAACP. On the other hand, it is precisely because their middle class positions place them in greater vulnerability and risk that the civil rights thrust has been so well "disciplined."

rights thrust has been so well "disciplines."

That this picture is changing is evident in the marches in cities around the country and, more recently, the dramatic experience in Selma. These events illustrate the increasing demand on the resources and accountability of the trained middle class Negro. They also illustrate an increasing responsiveness to that demand to stand up and be counted with his lower class "brother" whom he has shunned for so long.

Against the background of this changing picture the Negro teacher stands with other "white collar" workers in bold relief. They epitomize in growing measure what Lerone Bennett (The Negro Mood, 1964) calls "the development of a new self-conception in the Negro psyche and the growth of a revolutionary will to dignity."

SOME CLUES TO THE FUTURE

There are some observable trends in the civil rights movement which have serious portent for school people. Yet, as was stated earlier, to focus on racial matters is to risk endangering the important larger perspective. What follows here is intended to project a view of shifting strategies of the Negro struggle against the backdrop of change in the total community.

From Protest to Politics

This is the theme of one thoughtful treatment of "The Future of the Civil Rights Movement." (Bayard Rustin--Commentary, February, 1965). Mr. Rustin reminds us that

> The very decade which has witnessed the decline of legal Jim Crow has also seen the rise of de facto segregation in our most fundamental socio-economic institutions.

Both numerically and percentage-wise, more Negroes are unemployed today than a decade ago. Their median income is lower in proportion to white workers than it was ten years ago. A higher percentage of Negroes is now concentrated in jobs highly vulnerable to automation. More Negroes live in "de facto" segregated housing and attend "de facto" segregated schools than before the historic Supreme Court decision. And all of these things will get worse before they get better.

The popular assumption that removal of legal barriers would automatically lead to widespread integration of Negroes into all facets of American life has been revealed as a wishful thought. The Negro who now can eat in a restaurant but is without money to pay for the meal is no better off than before. The Negro who can afford to buy a home outside the ghetto, but at whose sight whites flee to the suburbs in panic is no closer to integration than ever. Indeed, he may be farther away. Similar is the plight of the Negro child to whom a college scholarship is now available but whose inferior education prevents its acceptance. As Mr. Rustin says, "these are the facts of life which generate frustration in the Negro Community and challenge the civil rights movement." They clearly indicate a turn toward political action. In a conscious bid for political power, tactics are shifting away from direct-action techniques. Rustin also refers to this as a shift to a strategy calling for the "building of community institutions or power bases," a la Alinski.

The demonstrations are not yet ended, of course. As a matter of fact, the situation is very likely to get hotter in some of the big cities before it gets cooler. But as the movement into the political arena gathers force, there is likely to be fewer and fewer sit-ins, boycotts and open demonstrations. The movement from protest to politics will be viewed with mixed emotions in some quarters. Protest, however vexatious, could be shrugged off or ignored, even punished. Political action cannot. But of particular interest to school people is the fact that the trend toward political action will bring an increasingly intelligent participation of Negroes in school affairs. This increased participation can be expected at several levels or combinations of levels--organizational and individual, political and voluntary.

It is to be expected also that some of the participation will take the form of "testing" for limits in a relatively new sphere of activity. This will be true particularly in the case of individuals who have had little positive experience as a participant in school affairs. It must be remembered that low status persons in general and Negroes in particular have stood in awe amounting almost to fear of schools and school people. Up to now, many school people have found that to be a convenient state of affairs and have exerted little effort to change it. There will be no ready reduction in the awe or fear of school people for these low status parents. Nor will there be any reduction in their respect and esteem for education and educators. But a growing sense of freedom and an accompanying need to make that sense of freedom articulate will force them to test the significance of these newly gained and strange life-meanings. Schools and school people, however awesome, are close at hand--and fair game for the testing.

It is important to understand this because it is apparent that, unless a pronounced trend is reversed, the school population of the central city will be increasingly dark in its complexion. The outlook is not all "dark," however. Increased participation in school affairs by Negroes will bring an increased "liberal" support badly needed by the big-city public schools. Such support could lead to basic curriculum reforms of which more will be said later. Moreover, the stage is now set for a more productive teacher-parent partnership in the learning process for Negro children. The widespread experiential deprivation of inner-city children cannot be reduced by the school alone; it will require the combined and total resources of school and community. Cooperative efforts to make optimum use of these resources on behalf of children will contribute to a further cessation of conflict and will provide vital nurture to an emerging concept of self-help in the Negro community.

Some Trends in the Larger Community

An editorial in a recent issue of one of the nation's largest Negro newspapers called attention to the many new employment opportunities for Negroes at certain occupational levels. The editorial stressed the significant quotes of several white industrialists to the effect that they had found non-discrimination in employment to be "Commercial as well as Christ-like." Gunnar Myrdal (Challenge of Affluence) notes this changing posture of the business community with the observation that at this period in history practical economic imperatives and American idealism have converged. In other words, Brotherhood is actually good business. And while that recognition is far from being universal, it is even now a dynamic to be reckoned with.

The economic factor, though important, is but one of many, including obvious worldwide forces which will bear more and more heavily on issues of civil rights in our cities. Kenneth Clark (Dark Ghetto) points to their psychological impact on the morale and drive of the American Negro:

> His (the Negro) aspirations are compatible with the world-wide democratic momentum; the resistance of those who would deny these aspirations is incompatible with this momentum, and therefore it is the Negro who has the most potential for actual power. In one sense this factor appears abstract and nebulous. But it may determine whether the power of the American Negro will remain largely either a verbal pseudopower, cathartic but inconsequential, or will culminate in actual social change.

These forces will not soon prevent the white flight to suburbia, however. There is no end in sight to the general distaste of white families for integrated housing. But even in this frustrating problem area there are some encouraging signs. In recent years, innumerable "Human Relations Councils" have organized for systematic programs of education and direct action toward open housing. Not even Dearborn, Michigan, a notorious citadel of Northern bigotry, has been immune from this new pestilence.

A recent Look magazine poll confirms these hopeful indications. The Gallup-conducted survey revealed that white Americans to the tune of eighty per cent (including more than three-fourths of the Southerners) say they would not move or sell their homes if a Negro family moved next door. Furthermore, the Nation's teenagers are even more willing than their parents to accept Negroes as neighbors.

Only eleven per cent indicated they would want their parents to move or sell their homes. The survey found similar responses to other questions dealing with issues such as Federal intervention in Civil rights, and particularly in the problem of Negro voting rights. In each case teen-age support was found to be even stronger than that of their parents. Surprising to many is the fact that nearly one-half of the Southerners polled favored Federal intervention to secure the right to vote for Negroes.

It is not really surprising to learn that many Southerners would not move away if Negroes moved next door to them. After all, in many Southern towns Negroes and whites have lived side by side for years without any notable damage to either. Nor is it surprising to learn that, according to this poll at least, "White Americans unequivocally support the Negro Cause." White Americans, though slow to learn in the area of civil rights, have come to recognize some of the right answers required in a Democratic society.

Despite the continuing general white exodus from the central city, many will remain for one reason or another. It is certain that those who stay will demand a higher quality of education for their children. If school people have found the Negro's thunderous protests disturbing, what will be their reaction to the "lightning" of an aroused white, middle-class citizenry?

A final brief word about the "forgotten man"--the poor white of the inner-city. Inarticulate and unorganized, he has been left to fend pretty much for himself. The mass-based organizations referred to earlier will provide a hopeful haven for him. If he seeks that haven in any appreciable numbers, it will add significant "white might" to the massive power sought by those efforts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR OFFENSIVE STRATEGIES

It seems clear that the development of offensive as opposed to defensive strategies will require that school people (1) acquire greater skill in intervention before crisis, (2) modify ways of viewing the community and interpreting what is seen and (3) move toward reconstruction of the educational process.

Intervention Before Crisis

Large city school administrators have spent entirely too much time and energy putting out fires instead of preventing them. Moreover, in the process we too often have fought fire with fire, instead of with education. We are educators, not civil rights experts. Our job is to translate civil rights concerns into educational concerns, and deal with them as such. Why, for example, do we need a civil rights group to tell us what is objectionable about a textbook? If the textbook treatment of Negroes is inadequate or unsound or downright harmful, as is often the case, it is an educational problem. If we need the specialized help of Negro experts in dealing with that problem, why not use those we have in the school system? If such problems require judgments and decisions which can be made only by high ranking administrators, why not rely on the judgment of the high-ranking Negro administrators we have in our school systems.

This is not to say that white administrators cannot exercise insightful judgments in educational matters having racial implications. Many can and do, else our schools would be in far worse shape than they are. Nor is it to say that Negro administrators should be looked to only for expertise on "Negro problems." A Negro appointed to high rank only to "sit by the door" or to deal only with so-called human relations problems is limited in his effectiveness from the very start. The Negro in question, however strongly he may resist it, will feel an inevitable pressure to show gratitude for his high appointment by saying what his superintendent wishes to hear instead of what he should hear. If the Negro administrator yields to that pressure, he is a "dead duck" as far as Negroes are concerned. If the administrator is not trusted in the community, he is of little value to the school, even as window-dressing.

Every large-city school system could use a few more of its competent Negroes in administrative capacities, preferably not in those labeled "human relations." To get them may require some modification of existing selection procedures, but this need not be regarded as a major catastrophe. There is some evidence that professional quality is not guaranteed by the tests and other screening devices now in widespread use. Gross and Herriott (Staff Leadership in Public Schools 1965) suggest the need for changes in current practices of selecting and assigning both administrators and teachers. Their study of Executive Professional Leadership emphasizes the "crucial importance of 'middle management' of large school systems . . . sector of the educational hierarchy that operates between school superintendent and principal . . ." Since the judgments of this echelon of leadership (and I would include principals) are vital to intervention before crisis, we would do well to reexamine the criteria for their selection. Gross and Herriott conclude, among other things, that high quality executive professional leadership depends greatly on five factors of which four are "(1) a high order of interpersonal skill, (2) the motive of service, (3) the willingness to commit off-duty time to his work, and (4) relatively little seniority . . ." We need better ways of seeking out potential administrative leadership possessing the skills and attitudes suggested by the above mentioned items.

Modifying Our View and Interpretation of the Community

A higher quality of administrative leadership would naturally contribute to a more perceptive view of the community. We also could use more help from the community itself. At one level we need the broad understandings which can accrue through study and planning with city-wide citizens advisory committees. Such committees, sincerely committed and meaningfully engaged, can be invaluable for consultation and feedback and as a base of community support for innovation. At another level there is need for more meaningful dialog between the local school unit and its own service area. It is in each local school unit that education becomes most real and observable for that particular segment of the community. Notwithstanding the behaviors of a Board of Education and its "top administration," the crucial reflections of the school system's image are seen by most people in the practices of the local schools.

Few people find serious fault with broad concepts of function for public education or with the basic educational purposes implied therein. Most disagreement and conflict occur at the point where a local school must translate broad societal purposes into the many operational goals which serve as guides to its concrete programs and services. As Myron Leiberman says (The Future of Public Education), "every pressure group is for the general welfare but each has its own version of what measures do in fact promote the general welfare." While a school system must be cognizant of and responsive to these pressure groups, it must also continue to build bridges to a broader base of support and direction which derives from the reciprocal understandings of a local school unit with its service area.

Sound educational practices demand consideration of differences among the various segments of the total community. No school is an island, however, no matter how unique its clientele may seem; thus, differences apparent in any one segment of the community must be considered always in relation to the total community. To the extent that practices in one school appear to differ from those in another, there will be the problem of understanding what are ends and what are means in the educational enterprise. Dialog to ensure maximum understanding of ends and means in education can go on best at the local school level.

Such dialog cannot take place in an autocratically oriented administrative structure. In such a situation, the local school and its community have nothing of importance to say to each other. In such a situation the real dialog inevitably moves upward along the hierarchy to where things of importance can be said and heard. When the dialog occurs at the top level of authority, parents often feel the need for more power than can be mustered within their local school neighborhood. Many otherwise purposeless community organizations would go out of business were it not for this need. More school-community conflict could be resolved closer to the local school level if the school system were structured more democratically to permit "the people" to speak and be spoken to at all levels of organization. This would require a greater degree of decentralization of administrative authority and responsibility than now commonly exists. It is not unreasonable to expect decentralization to work so long as the posture of the local school reflects an "institutional unity" across administrative lines of authority.

Reconstructing the Educational Process

It has been observed that schools have missed an excellent opportunity to effect major program changes under cover of the civil rights struggle--changes which for some time now have been dictated by socio-technological events. We have worked hard at modifying curriculum patterns and materials to make them more suitable for disadvantaged children, for Negro children. We have done so knowing all along that our traditional programs are not entirely suitable for advantaged children either. Fortunately, advantaged parents have not yet discovered this fact. For example, middle class white parents would be dismayed to learn that their children produce more under achievement than do disadvantaged children. If they knew this they would at once insist upon less rigidity in our school programs. They would demand a greater degree of personalization of standards and materials. They would seek reform and vengeance for our having cheated their children. If middle class white parents demanded these things, Negro parents would accept their worth and would want them also. Negroes are wary of perfectly sound educational devices like multiple text book adoptions and individualized approaches to reading because they are afraid we are trying to sell them something different and, by inference, inferior. Basically, very little has been prescribed as desirable for disadvantaged children that is not good for all children from "Head Start" to community college.

It is not simply a matter of improving programs of vocational education so there will be a place for non-academic youngsters. It is a matter of revamping the entire high school program to bring it more nearly in line with the realities of today's world. Instead of worrying about how to teach about Africa or Negro history, we should be concerned about the total Social studies offerings for all children.

More flexibility in organization, more creative teaching, more individualization of materials and more emphasis on learning how to learn ought to be the order of the day. New insights into the structure of subject matter, into cognitive organization, readiness and motivation make this possible. The fast-changing events of the societal scene make it necessary. Resources are becoming increasingly available to assist in the process.

Racial issues have caused an increasingly critical scrutiny of our schools. If these issues have helped school people themselves to take a hard look--beyond the racial issues--they will have been valuable beyond any intent of civil rights groups. But then, seeing beneath the surface is our job as educators. And with everything that is happening today in the world and in space, we have little time to waste.

THE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP IN BIG CITIES

Samuel Shepard, Jr.
Assistant Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

INTRODUCTION

Bigness is any aspect of human endeavor is at once a blessing and a curse. It brings into the lives of men many advantages that otherwise would not be available nor, indeed, even imaginable. At the same time, this bigness creates a multitude of problems that under ordinary circumstances would not exist. It seems hardly necessary to call to mind, as an illustration, that without bigness in industry, there would be no assembly line from which come artifacts--both large and small, simple and complex--all of which make the American way of life a fantastic miracle hardly to be believed by people from other lands even when their eyes behold its products. For example, a dweller in the rain-soaked jungles and dry plateaus of Africa, although he sees it vicariously (yet realistically) portrayed in motion pictures, often refuses to accept the reality of New York City--its towering skyscrapers, its roaring subways, broad avenues, and its sheer expanse!

These examples offer but a hint of the bounty that flows from bigness. Yet, as we have pointed out earlier, there is another side to the coin of bigness--the seamy side which causes the individual to sink somehow into anonymity and become just a number, a mere statistic among millions. And worse still, bigness seems to encourage an attitude of indifference to others almost to the point of callousness. Thus, we have seen passersby in large urban areas unhesitatingly walking or driving around a dying man stricken with a heart attack at the wheel of his automobile. We have read with horror and amazement of neighbors who heard the piercing screams of a murder victim, and yet with a clear conscience were able to merely glance out of their windows and shrug their shoulders. Not only does bigness spawn indifference and callousness to the needs and sufferings of others, but it also creates anxieties, fears, and frustrations all of which somehow grow out of the fast and almost furious pace of modern living--a pace that makes people forget that they are people--individuals--who are worth infinitely more than the biggest of systems and the most efficient of organizations. Bigness also often creates pockets of people who, for some reason or another, failed to keep up with the fast stream of life and have eddied to the side or into enclaves of isolation. In a word, bigness, in spite of all of the technical and even scientific advantages it makes possible, tends to swell the ranks of the poverty-stricken, the downtrodden, and the disadvantaged.

Thus, it is increasingly clear that the large urban centers of this nation, whose terminus in growth appears to be no where in sight, are becoming the very model of bigness in America, bringing with them both hitherto undreamed of possibilities for the uplifting of the human condition and equally unimagined possibilities for human misery and degradation. Moreover, each of the major institutions in these urban centers involves the same odd paradox.

The Need for Face-to-Face Relations Involving the School and Parents

The school, as one such institution, has not escaped the dilemma. It too is now big business, serving in some cities thousands and even a million children, and spending upwards of a billion dollars a year! As is the case of all big businesses, the school has become a big impersonal machine with a hierarchy of officials who, to many citizens, are either unapproachable or unknowable. More often than not, the principal and teachers who staff a neighborhood school are NOT themselves a part of that community. The result has been and continues to be a lack of communication between parents and school people if not downright dislike on the part of both parents and teachers for each other.

Obviously a state of affairs such as this in inter-personal relations cannot be expected to promote either interest in or cooperation with the school--two conditions that are the minimum essentials for success in solving the growing problems of the big cities and of urban education. The raison dé etre for good school-community relations is to insure a wholesome teaching-learning situation for children. We know all too well the attitude of parents toward education in general, and the local school in particular is crucial in determining the attitudes that children bring to the school. The need is abundantly clear for better school-community relations between school people and the parents living within the school community. Unfortunately, while the need is obvious, the means to meeting it are not so clearly in sight or easy to set in motion.

It would seem, though, that there are some rather simple guidelines which might help us reach the desired result. We in the Banneker District in St. Louis believe we have found at least the rudiments of these principles. We have found that our entree into the confidence and ultimately into the whole-hearted acceptance of our parents is simply an honest, frank appeal to them to join us in an endeavor dedicated solely to the important objective of helping their children find, prepare for, and live the good life--a life which they, the parents, very often do not presently have, never have had, and have very little likelihood of ever enjoying. We accept the responsibility of convincing parents that we are honestly interested in them and the welfare of their children. That means we do more than give lip-service to our invitation to them to be partners.

We make a real effort to convince our teachers that beneath the dirt, bad language, tardiness, and even recalcitrance on the part of any one of their pupils is the unique and infinitely precious human being whose inherent dignity renders him worthy of our most sincere respect and efforts to bring his potentialities to the fullest possible development. An attitude such as this is a long step toward establishing that one-to-one relationship I have just identified as the crying need in today's urban schools. Next, we visit our parents frequently; we invite them to plan with us and to help us educate their children. In every way, we endeavor to prove in concrete terms our firm belief in their and their children's worth! In short, we welcome them as members of our team! And we're getting some results. Parents who heretofore were reluctant to take part in school planning and activities are now assuming positions of real leadership, making valuable suggestions, initiating programs, and playing a true partner's role in this complex business of educating their children!

Yes, the antidote for bigness and the evils of impersonality and isolation that almost inevitably spring from it can, indeed, be counteracted by a deliberate effort on the part of school people to break down the communications barrier erected by mutual distrust and suspicion. This break-through can be affected by seeking and strengthening face-to-face relationships with parents and school people. Such relationships will offer to parents roles other than those of passive recipients of school-decided plans and programs. Are there any unsurmountable obstacles to this break-through? I would answer unhesitantly, "no!" But, there _are_ difficulties, to be sure. Among these difficulties are the stereotyped notions, images if you will, that school people often have of disadvantaged parents and that such parents frequently have of the school and its practices. Let us, for a moment, consider briefly a few of these obstacles: (1) the School Report Card and the problems it creates, (2) the many and sundry attitudes that both teachers and parents often have, and (3) the various images that parents themselves have of school people.

The Report Card

Neither time nor the purposes of this meeting will permit a lengthy discussion of the merits and demerits of the school report card. It is, however, sufficient to review it as a force in school-community relationships.

The report card, whatever the desirable reasons which it is intended to serve, is a rather cold and indifferent mode of communication. It does not, indeed, it cannot be a face-to-face dialogue between parent and teacher. It is not even a satisfactory monologue because often it consists of little cubicles to be filled in with symbols such as E for excellent, G for good, and so forth. More often than not, the card cannot explain adequately all of the conditions of the child's reaction to the school situation. Much confusion and misunderstanding between the home and school stems from this fact. Frequently, on the back of each card are a few lines for parents to write their comments--presumably a promise to cooperate more with the school by seeing to it that little Johnny comes more on time during the next marking period and that he talks less in class. Generally, the parent signs the card and writes the statement, but under protest and with misgivings. Obviously, regardless of the advantages and disadvantages of the report card, it just simply cannot foster the kind of inter-communication and, more importantly, the inter-personal relations that are the foundation for trust, confidence, understanding and cooperation so greatly needed if the school and the parents in the community are to improve their relationships. No, I am not advocating the discontinuance of report cards. I only want to point out that this instrument cannot count among the many good things it does that of promoting and cementing good school-community mutual understanding, trust, and cooperation.

School and Parental Attitudes

We all are well acquainted with the many kinds and shades of attitudes which school people and parents have toward each other. Sociologists have forcefully called our attention to the parent whose least concern or worry is what takes place at school as long as it keeps Johnny off the street and out of her hair during the day. We know, too, of the frequency of not only parental indifference but also downright parental hostility toward the school--a hostility which manifests itself in subtle and sometimes not so subtle ways to the child. We have read about and perhaps even experienced the frustration that comes in trying to deal with parental indifference, fear, insecurity, and hostility! We know, too, in perhaps a vague and coolly professional way, that there are reasons for these parental attitudes. Similarly, but perhaps more subjectively, we know of teacher notions about parents --especially lower class parents. We have seen or have been perpetrators ourselves of condescending speech and ways on the part of teachers and principals in their reactions to non-middle class parents. In short, we all know the prevailing pattern of attitudes in many of our urban home and school relationships--parents convinced that teachers are looking down their noses at them, and teachers just as sure that parents are obstinate, uncooperative, if not actually rude and uncouth!

Obviously, to the degree that attitudes on both sides are such as those identified above, they cannot possibly lead to better face-to-face dialogues and ultimately to improved school and community relationships. Of course, it is quite easy to point out that these attitudes must change and be made more realistic. But, it is quite another thing to point out specific ways in which this desired end can be attained. I believe, however, that we in the Banneker District again have found a basic principle whose implementation will achieve the desired end. We have found that nothing makes one change his fixed notions about another person as readily as through personal contacts and actual experience in working with that person on some project or problem. The general answer, then, to the problem of parent-teacher-principal attitudes seems to be the following general rule:

> Get them involved together as partners working toward the solution of some common problem or the attainment of some common goal.

Surely, there must be countless areas and ways in which school administrators and teachers can get parents in on planning and carrying out of worthwhile school-connected projects. We have introduced many activities and programs in our district that have been extremely valuable in establishing good rapport with parents. The time limit on this paper permits only a partial listing of projects:

(1) workshop for parents (small group discussion on topics of interest selected by parents)

(2) parents serving as "Homework managers"

(3) parent participation in "Operation Dine-out" (a program for seventh grade pupils)

(4) parental evaluation of a variety of special programs such as "Operation Dine-out"

(5) Banneker District Council of Parent Organizations

(6) "Study-In Month" sponsored by parents under leadership of

the District Council

(7) skits and playlets presented by parents to parent audiences

(8) parent participation on "Mr. Achiever" radio program.

The School Image

Not the least detracting from good school-community relationships are the various images created intentionally or inadvertently by school people. And, oddly enough, all of the school personnel contribute toward this image--from the school custodian to the school principal. What is this image? Actually, the school is seen in many different lights, depending largely on the cultural group viewing it. To middle class America, this institution is a welcomed and almost revered part of the community. Its goals are, for all practical purposes, identical with those of the people it serves; its language, aspirations, values, and attitudes are likewise the same. It follows, therefore, that school people who lend personality and vitality to this social agency are generally respected and, to a large extent, esteemed by the middle class as living embodiments of much of the middle class ideal. However, to an increasing number of in-migrants to the nation's urban centers, and to low income poeple, the school looms large as a forbidding abstraction, impersonal if not actually indifferent to the points of view, ways of life, needs, and problems of the people whose children it teaches. Indeed, for many of these disadvantaged persons and their children, the school is seen as an alien force, not to be trusted or cooperated with! Unhappily, many school people, in their dealings with parents and pupils constituting this sub-cultural group, have inadvertently or deliberately reinforced this negative image! They have done so primarily through condescension both in their speech and in their interpersonal relationships with the recent in-migrant. The result, of course, is an image which is part real and part fictitious yet effectively blocks communication between the school and many of the pupils and their parents.

It would appear that the guidelines for removing this serious barrier to good school-community relationships is the age old dictum that "respect begets respect." Teachers, principals, supervisors, specialists and guidance workers, really everyone connected with the school in an official capacity, must come to see and appreciate the universal inherent dignity of all human beings, regardless of the accidents of their birth, color, or economic status. Mere lip-service recognition of this dignity and artificial, condescending inter-personal actions designed to create a belief that one does respect all men will not suffice for the simple reason that such attitudes and behaviors will not be believed. It is, I am convinced, this basic attitude of condescension on the part of school people which blocks communication because it precludes mutual trust and cooperative efforts on the part of many members of the disadvantaged community.

The focus in this discussion has been on the inter-personal relations between school personnel and parents of the children of the local school community. It should not be inferred that there are not other important school-community relationships. There are--the Banneker District has developed a friendly and good working relationship with practically all of the community agencies within the district. The Banneker District Council of Ministers is further evidence of our efforts to enlist the full support of all individuals and groups in our community.

Potential School-Community Problems

The kind of problems which might arise between a school and its community are, it would seem, directly proportional to the subcultural status of the community being served. These problems have their roots, as we have attempted to point out, in a basic disorientation of the parents toward the school and toward the middle class values, aspirations, and behavior patterns it represents and strives to achieve. Among the more serious problems are those of indifferent and even hostile parents who not only will not assist the school in its efforts to motivate their children, but also will tend to withhold support from the school. Related to this problem is the dwindling tax base which results from replacement by low income groups of the more affluent and school-oriented middle class which is moving as fast as it can and in increasing numbers to the suburban regions of the big cities. We have an influx, then, of children whose cultural environments during their formative years is presenting the school with yet another function for an already over-taxed budget and professionally-extended personnel--that of promoting pupil readiness for school experiences! Most reliable figures predict that the urban pupil population within five years will be made up of 50 percent culturally disadvantaged learners. This prediction augurs ill in terms of the many problems which the school of tomorrow will face in its efforts to work with and for the community it serves.

Conclusion

The picture is foreboding but the guidelines are clear for making it brighter: respect and cooperate with those whom we serve. The question is--will we take up the challenge and work toward better school-community relations?

THE INEVITABLE CHANGE IN SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS

Arthur H. Rice
Professor of Education
Indiana University and editorial advisor,
The Nation's Schools

It is *not* the purpose of this discussion to study the techniques of communication, but rather to take a sharp, critical look at the public relations problems of public school administration. Two major concerns face us now: (1) racial integration within the schools and (2) the increasing difficulty in getting local support for public schools.

The previous speaker has offered some realistic answers for the first problem. I shall deal with the second, namely, the struggle to get adequate funds for public schools from local tax sources. I maintain that in this effort we are fighting a losing battle, and we will continue to do so unless major changes are made in three directions.

The first of these three weaknesses is a false philosophy concerning the primary purpose of the public school. I have been in the business of school public relations for more than forty years, and during all this time I have been bombarded by speeches, articles and books which preached the philosophy that the taxpayer must be "sold" the idea that the public school is the road to personal success. Admittedly, this is a by-product, but the real justification for a tax-supported system of education is the development of citizens who are capable of self-government. You and I pay school taxes so that our government can discover, protect and develop this nation's *human* resources. This is a basic responsibility for every citizen, not a personal option. Today, more and more local taxpayers are assuming they have the right to refuse to support public education, because they are not "sold" by this personal success sales pitch. Year after year, our schools and colleges have produced citizens and voters who have no real understanding as to why public education is the very foundation of our freedoms. And our institutions of higher learning, year after year, turned out teachers who were just as ignorant of the "why" and "how" of public education. And that's the mess we are in today.

The second weakness is an unjustified confidence in the current practice of school public relations. A professionally trained public relations director (or someone serving the same function under some other title) is now a member of the central staff of nearly every medium size or large school district. In smaller districts, the superintendent takes on this responsibility personally. In either case, the optimism prevails that the public relations efforts of our public schools have improved considerably during the past decade or so. I believe they have! But improvement is not enough! Other institutions and agencies that compete with public education for the taxpayers dollar have been equally successful. Their public relations agents have increased their competencies, and their programs have received increased support from their constituents. Consequently, our "improvement" in school public relations has barely enabled us to keep pace with our competitors.

Even more serious, in my judgment, is the fact that the so-called school public relations director is, in reality, the public relations agent for the superintendent of schools. This is not necessarily a reflection upon the ethics or the abilities of the superintendent. Rather, it is a recognition of the fact that the press and other makers of public opinion keep the chief school administrator constantly on the defensive. Tradition does not permit him to admit errors in judgment. Ipso facto, the public relations program of that district becomes primarily a defense of the manner in which the superintendent administers the school system. What is the alternative? I doubt that there is an immediate solution. There is the hope that eventually the professionally trained public relations specialist will be so competent and secure in his occupation that he can operate as an honest counsellor to the superintendent and the school board, even though his recommendations may not coincide with the wishes or the ambitions of other key people in the power structure.

There is the hope, too, that school public relations eventually will become a science in human behavior. The activities of the staff would involve fact-finding and research upon which clear-cut decisions could be made. How often today are public relations policies determined by the domination of a personality rather than the strength of demonstrated facts? Our so-called public relations efforts are destined to be more and more discouraging unless we move quickly out of our present Nineteenth Century pattern of public school financing. More than half (56.2 percent) of the support of public schools in this country comes from the property tax or other local sources of revenue, according to the 1964-65 N.E.A. study. But not many children today continue to live in the same school neighborhood as adults. Did you? The mobility of the American people indicates that your present neighbors probably attended schools in other cities and counties, and in other states. Why, then, do we continue to put the burden of education upon the local property owner?

Glibly and truthfully, we teach that education is a function of the state government. And we talk and talk about equal educational opportunities for all the children of all the people. Put these two ideals together and there is only one conclusion: It is the responsibility of the state to assure that educational opportunities are completely equalized within the state. But our antiquated system of local taxation means that each school district sets its own standard of high quality, mediocre achievement, indifference or neglect, and the kind of education a child receives is determined by where his parents happen to live.

Of course, the federal government has a big obligation here, too. Our national security and prosperity are largely dependent upon education. The Congress is aware of this and is responding by appropriating hugh sums for purposes that are labeled "education." But these monies are not directed into the main channel of the public school system where the costs of operation bear heavily and unequally on the local taxpayer. The Congress can help best by distributing its financial support through the state governments rather than build a supplementary federal system of education that could be both wasteful and perilous. We are in that danger zone right now!

One major purpose of this seminar, I believe, is to explore the needs and opportunities for research in education. For decades and decades educational leaders have been deploring the lack of funds for research in education. And then, all of a sudden, the flood-gates are let loose. The United States Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, recently told a group of us that the federal government has labeled more than 8.7 billion dollars for activities and causes that it calls educational to be spent in 1966. That's 8,700 million dollars! And in the neighborhood of $3 billion of this amount will be cleared through the U. S. Office of Education. A generous slice of this 8,700 million dollars has been earmarked for uses that are called research, and the expenditure of nearly all of this money will involve purposes, assumptions and activities that will need evaluation and call for endless kinds of research. But where are the qualified, the trained individuals to do it? This "flood" has happened so fast that institutions of higher learning just have not kept pace. Here is a need for a crash program for the recruitment and training of researchers. But I haven't heard any crash on the campuses, have you? In fact, I've hardly heard a pin drop. Here, then, is the immediate crucial need for the development of thousands of individuals who can operate effectively in educational research activities, on the local and the state level as well as on a national basis.

More specifically, let's see what is indicated for research in this area that we call public school relations. Those of us who specialize in this activity would like to think that we are a unique profession, or that we soon will be. But are we? One of the earmarks of a profession is a background of technical knowledge. How much knowledge that is unique to public relations is now available to us in books and in other sources of information? Most of what we have in our literature is empirical deduction. We have developed a lot of rules of thumb. Some gadgets and processes are more effective than others, but we will never have the technical knowledge that will make us a profession until we have research that goes far beyond the present surveys, questionnaires, and the very limited insight we have been able to get so far from the behavioral sciences. As you undoubtedly know, virtually every kind of federal grant to local school districts requires the recipient to make some kind of evaluation of the project and to report back to the government, along with an audit. Here alone is a tremendous demand for people who know how to conduct research so as to recommend improvement or change.

But you may say, "What kinds of research are suitable or practical in the field of public school relations?" Most urgently needed right now, I believe, is concentrated and competent effort to derive from the behavorial sciences everything that is possible for us to learn or assume from their research, in so far as it affects the communication of ideas and the formation of opinions. Especially, we need to know more, much more, about how attitudes are formed. I'm not so sure that the behavorial sciences know so much about it either, but at least they have been doing a lot more research than we have. After learning what we can from the behavorial sciences, I think school public relations as a special occupation will need to set up its own research to test the practical applications of the behavorial sciences to school and community relations.

For those of us involved in the daily grind, there's a bit of research that would be most helpful. We would like to know just how our fellow workers in this field called public school relations have to spend their time. Is as much of it devoted to putting out brush fires as seems to be our lot? Perhaps if we could show our administration superiors how much of our time is spent in covering up mistakes of the past and how little of it in doing long time planning and basic research for the future, we might be able to bring about some change in the traditional "play it safe" policies.

There's one more question you have asked that I would like to recognize, although I cannot give an answer that completely satisfies me. You have asked:

"What kind of training and preparation do you think should be required of the individual who becomes the specialist in school public relations?" There are two parts to my answer. In the first place, the improvement of school public relations cannot be delegated to any one individual. In one sense of the word, it is the responsibility of every one who is employed by the school system. More specifically, it becomes a responsibility of every one who has administrative responsibility within the school system. Without question, the person who is in truth and in fact the director of public relations is the chief school administrator. When he hires others to whom he gives such titles as director of school community relations, or director of informational services, or assistant superintendent in charge of public relations, he is merely delegating certain responsibilities for skills, fact finding and operational direction for which he himself is eventually accountable. What I am saying is that the improvement of school public relations is a function of the entire administrative staff rather than a concern that can be delegated to one person or to one office and then be forgotten by the others.

You see, this concept determines to a large degree the second part of my answer to your question: "What kind of training should the public relations specialist have?" My answer is that the one individual or the group of people who become the so-called public relations personnel must collectively have training, experience, skills and all-around competency in all phases of communication. This includes the transmission of facts and ideas that are of concern or interest to the public, the recording and interpretation of these facts, and the planning and conducting of research that will improve relations between schools and community. These individuals should be able to advise the superintendent and the board as to how patrons of that particular school system will react to the policies and program put into effect by the administration.

Now can you tell me the kinds of training and experience the public relations specialist needs? It seems that he needs a broad understanding of virtually all the major phases of school administration but with special skills and competencies in the fields of communication and opinion forming. But you are going to say: "The individual who has all that training and ability will soon be the school superintendent."

Fine, perhaps that is one of the better ways that we can develop school administrators! With classroom teachers and academic specialists demanding a greater voice in the development of the curriculum and the application of teaching methods, I predict that the school administrator of the future is going to concentrate more on the broad management of the school system. He will employ specialists for virtually every major phase of the instructional program, and he will look more and more to the judgement and counsel of his professionally minded teachers for recommendations pertaining to working conditions and environment. But his responsibility for public relations will increase and increase.

THE REORGANIZATION OF LARGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS - IMPLICATIONS OF DECENTRALIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATORS

B. J. Chandler, Dean
School of Education
Northwestern University

Boards of education, school administrators and teachers in cities are challenged to provide education for a society that did not exist even a decade ago. The population is continually increasing and changing in composition. The aspiration level of adults for their children continues to rise. The demands imposed by technological, economic, and social changes require improved educational programs. Education for all is beginning at an earlier age and continuing longer than at any time in our history.

New and pressing educational problems are especially acute in large cities. Short tenure of superintendents of schools, the continuing serious shortage of teachers, open and bitter controversy involving various organized groups and flight to the suburbs all attest to the critical nature of the educational problem in cities.

Governmental agencies are key instruments through which cities seek to solve human problems. These receive vital support from private and volunteer organizations. As yet, however, such agencies and groups have not evolved patterns of organization, procedures of operation, or plans for fully utilizing intellectual resources that are attuned to the needs of large urban complexes. Schools, which are the major force for improving human existence, along with other social agencies, are still searching for formulas for most efficient services to people. Until workable administrative organizations uniquely adapted to the large city are developed, education as well as other governmental services are destined to continued frustration.

What large cities need is a plan of organization for education that is uniquely designed for the realities and complexities of the rapidly changing forces, the scientific-technological economy, and the humanistically sensitive social revolutions of the urban age.

Several people over the years have been calling for innovations in the organization and administration of school systems in large cities. In 1961, Lindley J. Stiles, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin, and I collaborated on a chapter entitled, "Urban Schools for the Future," published in 1962 in a volume by Dodd, Mead and Company under the title Education in Urban Society. In the chapter referred to, a section was devoted to what we called "The System-Unit Organization for Urban Schools." The opening sentence reads "Decentralization within the larger metropolitan structure is a challenge confronting all urban organizations today." We used the words "System-Unit" in an effort to express a new concept of school organization, realizing that the current notion of decentralization as represented by twenty or so so-called districts within large cities is obsolete. The concept that we are searching for and recommend experimentation with is really functional decentralization.

The kind of school-community plan of organization for education in large cities envisioned will require new decisions about the organization and administration of schools. The central premise Stiles and I advanced in our "System-Unit" discussion is this: the objective is to recapture the strength of the community school while retaining the benefits of bigness that the city offers. This achievement will require the organization of schools in such fashion that educational programs and services will be flexible, adaptable, and above all responsive to individual student needs. Much of educational decision-making will have to be brought closer to people at the community level. A partnership between community schools and the larger city unit will need to be established to permit policy making and execution to be decentralized. Further, each school will need to be accorded a sufficient degree of autonomy, within the broad framework of the city-wide system, to permit it to relate functionally and efficiently to pupils and parents and other citizens of its community.

Several others have written about the organizational problem facing large cities. Dr. Harold Webb referred to some of these in his paper. For instance, Dr. James B. Conant has recommended smaller administrative units, each with its own board of education. Webb reported that board members he polled felt that Conant's suggestion is not feasible. My question is, who knows until some of the cities experiment with such a plan. This conference has as one purpose identifying researchable topics or questions. Decentralization is a researchable topic of basic importance, in my judgment.

Webb also referred to the questions raised recently in an article in Saturday Review by Fred Hechinger. I think we have to take seriously the questions raised by Hechinger. Is the large city superintendency an impossible assignment today? Is the machinery obsolete for urban areas?

John Polley, in Education in Urban Society, states this position: "When authority is decentralized, the person granted local power remains responsible to the same group of officials that delegated the authority. At the top of this hierarchy usually is an elected board or assembly to whom all the officials are responsible. . . . Because local officials (in large cities) are responsible to higher authority, rather than to those they serve, their clients have no direct means of influencing policy or action; even more important, perhaps, the official loses the freedom of action which true responsibility would confer on him." Polley's thesis is that school administrators have authority but not responsibility. Accepting this position for sake of discussion, I would suggest some pilot studies where local administrators have both authority and responsibility. This means that at least in given areas, let's say curriculum as well as instructional materials, a district administrator would have final authority and he would be responsible to a local board of education in those functions specified. If New York established only thirty-one districts, they stopped short of doing the job. My guess is that fifty or sixty local districts would provide a more workable organizational pattern.

Aaron Cicourel, a sociologist at the University of California, in a companion chapter to Polley's, stated: "Increase in the size of school districts and the number of administrators, teachers and students, will lead to more social and administrative distance between the board's and superintendent's direct control of activities. . . . An Administrator who is cut off from day-to-day school activities would be expected to behave like similar bureaucratic officials in hospitals, prisons, and factories who orient their efforts toward staying within a prescribed budget, avoiding scandals, maintaining good public relations, and turning out good products." One question to test Cicourel's argument is this: How difficult is it, assuming that it is even possible, for an idea or a decisional premise to get transmitted from a local school system to the upper administrative echelons, and action taken? Then we wonder why teachers become hostile, organize, and have third party representatives. And what about the parent at the local level? How can he influence policy? For consideration, I suggest that the criterion for deciding at what level final authority and responsibility should rest is that they be placed as close to the scene of action as is possible.

A decentralization plan could be devised to take advantage of bigness. For instance, the superintendent of schools and the board of education could deal with the legislature and city fathers, and increasingly with federal authorities. They could maintain a centralized purchasing department with real latitude from districts. They could provide for the utilization of computers and other record keeping technological hardware. They could conduct, or cause to be conducted, studies of social, economic, demographic, and educational developments or conditions that have a long range effect on education.

My bias is evident from these remarks and from what I have previously written on the subject. Some empirical evidence is available to support the contention that large city schools are beginning to think seriously about decentralization. Paul Woodring, writing in the July 17, 1965 issue of Saturday Review, states the case for decentralization and reports that the New York City Board of Education, in a meeting on June 30, just a month ago, approved a plan to subdivide the City into thirty-one locally administered districts of about 35,000 pupils and thirty schools each. Woodring also reported that the multiversity of Clark Kerr is being decentralized. More authority and responsibility are being transferred to chancellors of the nine campuses. I submit that there are sound reasons for such decentralization and suggest again that experimental work should be done with a "System-Unit" type of organizational structure.

On the negative side, one must raise the question regarding one-class neighborhoods. How a socio-economically heterogeneous pupil population could be assembled, I simply do not know. Neither do I have an answer to the problem of racial segregation resulting from housing patterns under a decentralized program. However, the latter problem (racial segregation) will be solved before the one socio-economic class neighborhood will, in my judgment. The one socio-economic neighborhood is the next battle ground for schools.

Another argument on the negative side has to do with the question, suppose a decentralization plan is desirable, how do we put into operation such a plan? Again, I have no answer other than to experiment.

Doubtless there are other negative points that could be presented. Since I am more familiar with those on the positive side, and I find the arguments logical and compelling, I've concentrated on presenting thinking of those who favor attempts to decentralize. Assuming agreement with the premise that decentralization is a researchable problem, what are the key questions that need study and experimentation? I suggest the following:

1. How many administrators and other personnel can report effectively to one school executive?

2. How many administrative levels can prevail in a school organization before efficiency in communications and decision making is seriously impaired?

3. How can the teacher's sense of professional status and his feeling that he can exercise some influence over his own destiny be enhanced through organizational and administrative changes in large city schools?

4. What devices might help to stabilize heterogeneous communities and mitigate against one class neighborhoods?

5. Is it feasible and desirable to legally delegate final authority and responsibility to administrators at various levels in a large city? If so, what are the various functions and at which level should final authority and responsibility rest?

6. Would conflict resolution be enhanced if teachers and parents could influence decisions and practices at the local level?

7. How can educational programs be adapted to the aspirations and abilities of local people through a feasible plan of decentralization?

8. How can local boards (on an area or district basis) serve the checks and balances function and free the central board and superintendent to deal with larger, city-wide, and long-range educational planning?

9. What is the optimum size of local districts and local schools?

10. What impact on school organization and administration is being made by the Economic Opportunities Act, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and other Federal legislation? What are the implications for decentralization plans?

11. What conceptual schemes and research designs should be formulated in advance of experimentation?

Until carefully conceived and objectively prosecuted research studies are conducted, I suggest that statements by educators regarding school organization are simply personal opinions, often myopic and traditional in nature. My recommendation is for cities to experiment with various approaches to decentralization in an effort to achieve the advantages of a large centralized system while realizing the important values and advantages that local control and participation might provide.

LARGE CITIES--STATE DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIPS:
PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

G. E. Watson
Formerly Wisconsin State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

It is customary to attest to one's pleasure at being present. I want merely to attest to my feeling of inadequacy--inadequacy in the midst of scholars, specialists, and you, the administrators of the large city school systems. I sincerely trust that one very ordinary presentation, entirely lacking in profundity, will not mar the seminar too much.

The title calls for Problems and Prospects; problems and prospects in the relationships between large cities and state departments of education. Let us approach the problems first. In so doing, it seems essential that I share with you one underlying conviction that I have. In a period of twelve years of association with my fellow state superintendents or commissioners, I came to realize that one could not accurately generalize about these 47, 48, or 49 other educators, about their tasks, their problems, their capabilities, or their ambitions. One could only become aware of one apparently clear cut fact: each state superintendency is different from each of the others, each state superintendency operates a little differently, largely because of the population size and the location of each state and the history and traditions of each office. But as this belief of mine is considered, accepted or rejected by you, there is one fact, beyond all question, stated best of all in the 1963 A.A.S.A. Yearbook on Inservice Education for Administrators. The Yearbook Commission of Scholars, large and small city administrators appointed by A.A.S.A. President Benjamin Willis, summed up all of the theory underlying state departments of education when it said, "The central point of responsibility for public education in every state is the state educational agency. Every state has a chief state school officer . . . . The prime responsibility of the state educational agency is the improvement of the schools and the total educational endeavor. It is the agency through which the legislature expresses the will of the people and it gives form and order to the state's responsibility for education; it is the agency through which the state regulates the schools." Later the report says, "The state educational agency is responsible to all of the people in the state; it serves everybody; and if it performs its function well, the basis for decision and action is strengthened and improved. This broad state-wide leadership responsibility can never be pushed into the background or treated lightly."

But, states vary. In some of the states the concept of leadership by the state department of education, leadership for all of the state including the large cities, may come as a shock to the administrative leadership, the professional personnel as well as the residents of these large cities. For the leadership role has come with difficulty to the state departments and for several reasons. Thurston and Roe, in their book State School Administration, say: "The concept that education in a legal sense is a state function may be easily proved. Its roots had been firmly embedded in the past by colonial law that foreshadowed state law, its pattern was developed through ordinances governing the territories that were to become states. When the United States became a reality, the structural pattern of education as a state function began to grow through general reservation of power in the federal constitution, the positive expressions in the state constitutions and through statutory practice and review." This is the history in practically every state. But even with this sound historical basis, the establishment of state departments and state superintendencies to carry out this important state responsibility came about slowly. The strengthening of these state departments to a level appropriate for their task came about even more slowly.

State boards of education were established first, then state superintendencies, and finally, the departments of education to perform the functions given by the boards or the legislature to the state superintendent. New York state created the first board, but it was an administrative agency for higher education. The first state board with authority to disburse funds for elementary and secondary education came into being in North Carolina in 1825. The first state board resembling a modern state board was established in Massachusetts in 1837, with Horace Mann, of course, as the secretary. The position of state superintendent was first created in New York in 1812 at a salary of $300 per year. Maryland followed in 1826 and a few years later Michigan. But the movement was not fast; by 1850 only 17 states had created the position. The states that have created the position since 1850 include such states as Illinois, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Texas. So, if our public education started in the acts of the General Court of Massachusetts in 1642 to 1647, and if, as Thurston and Roe say, "The solution today seems natural --with the state maintaining legal supremacy, and acting as the fulcrum to provide proper balance for the local community, on one side, where schools can be kept close to the people and the national government, on the other, where the general welfare can be safeguarded . . ." --if that is the natural solution, we have taken quite a while to provide that fulcrum in the form of state departments of education that are strong and worthy of their task.

The job description of that early superintendency in New York state gives us a clue to the typical developments in state departments. Dr. Steve Knezevich, recently appointed Associate Secretary of the A.A.S.A., in his book Administration of Public Education, says, "The early duties of New York's chief state school officer were to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the common school, to prepare and report estimates and expenditures of school money, to give information to the legislature respecting all matters referred to him by either branch and generally to perform all services relative to the welfare of the schools." And remember--all this for $300 per year.

But this does illustrate the changing tasks of state departments and of state superintendents, the changing view of the type and stature of the men and women needed to staff these departments. Most scholars in the field agree that from the establishment of state departments to about the year 1900, this first stage of development in state departments was the statistical stage. To quote Knezevich again, "During this time, the state department, as an organization, was concerned primarily with gathering, compiling and publishing statistics; preparing forms, making biennial reports, publishing income studies and similar duties." In the year 1900, at the end of this era, there were only 177 staff members in all of the state departments of the entire nation. Understandably, it was easy for the state superintendent or commissioner and his staff to spend most, if not all, of their time in the office.

But the educational historians agree that around the year 1900, with considerable variation and overlapping, the statistical stage changed to the inspectoral stage which, in most states, lasted until about 1930. The superintendent and his staff got out into the field. One historian writes: "It was believed that all the state had to do was to enact standards and then send inspectors to determine if the standards were observed." During these decades, inspectors were added; the 177 staff members in all the departments across the country had grown to 1,760 in 1930. In some of the more progressive states, the inspectors came to be known as school visitors or supervisors. But Beach and Gibbs, in their book Personnel of State Departments, add sadly, "In neither the statistical nor inspectoral stage, was the state department geared primarily to assist local educational authorities in improving educational programs."

At approximately 1930, in the typical state department, the inspectoral concept was changed to a leadership concept. Under this new concept there was and there is a need for a new type of departmental staff member. Dr. Knezevich's language is interesting: "The leadership stage creates the need for the specialist or consultant, competent in a particular professional area but, at the same time, possessing a broad understanding of public education in general." Up-to-date figures on the present number of staff members seem to be quite variable; but the 1930 figure of 1,760 changed to a nation-wide total of 5,400 in 1945, over 15,000 in 1955, some 20,000 in 1960, with rapid acceleration since that time.

This brief historical overview has not been without purpose. Have there been problems between state departments and large cities, and what are the prospects for the future? Here we must especially remember the individual nature of the states and the tremendous variability between departments. In a general way, certainly, there have been problems; but it seems to be much more helpful to be concerned about the cause of the problems if we are subsequently to evaluate the prospects for the future. What are some of these causes?

First, as each of the state departments has moved through its historical development from its statistical concept through the inspectoral stage to the leadership viewpoint, the expansion and extension of services have been directed more to smaller school systems than to the large city systems. The reasons for this are easy to understand. A report of the Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago discusses the relation between the state and local districts at length and concludes: "Local administrators want and need the assistance of persons with larger vision . . . . They seek the consultant with or without legal authority who can help them to help themselves." Why haven't state departments, in the regular routine of personnel development, added people to their staff who would be sought out more universally by the large cities? The most obvious answer is that employment in the typical state department is much more desirable both professionally and economically to the educator in the small school system than to the similarly effective educator at work in the large city system. Hence, in many state departments the competence and experience of the usual staff member is in the problems of the smaller school system. Even though the acts of teaching in the large city and the small city are quite similar, one who has not had the large city experience is deemed less effective in advising on problems in the large cities. How real a handicap this is remains a question when one remembers that in many instances the problem has nothing to do with the size of the city. The question is even a little more perplexing when one remembers that many of the best of the large city people have come via the smaller city. But it is too common a situation that state department staff members will not be sought out for counsel in the large cities as they are in the smaller communities. The net result of all these factors is that the staff of the usual state department, efficient though it may be, is not as well geared historically to be of maximum assistance to the large cities.

There is another related but slightly different factor affecting this relationship. The most pressing professional task confronting the state superintendent and the state department may not involve the large city system in a direct way. May I suggest a personal experience which could be repeated by many superintendents? As state superintendent for twelve years, my most pressing task, looking at the state as a whole, was the reduction of the number of school districts from over 6,000 to a workable number. That number is now down to about 600 and is declining every day. But during those twelve years, while relations were most cordial with Superintendent Vincent and while the state office continued to have important legal and fiscal relationships with the Milwaukee Public Schools, the major state concern did not involve the processes of education in Milwaukee. New and emerging school districts needing new and different curricula, new and additional services, shifting old and sentimental loyalties to new and strange schools--these were the tasks that confronted the state department staff and gave the state superintendent his scars and bruises. The Milwaukee schools did not add to the bruises.

I do not wish to leave the wrong inference at this point. We must not generalize too much. In many states, in some of your states, the relationship between the state department and the large city systems has not only been cordial, it has also been effective. But the problems of these relationships, if problems there have been, have arisen from the inability of the state to render the proper leadership service and possibly they have arisen in some places because of the less than urgent desire on the part of the cities to receive that available service. In many instances, problems may have arisen over the place of the relative needs of the large cities in the priority listing of the educational needs of all of the state.

The problems, as I have known them, however, do not arise from professional antagonisms or from unwillingness to give the proper service or to receive that proper service, if and when available. It seems to me that usually the problems arise from (1) a state agency not adequately staffed or financed to render all needed services to all schools in the state and (2) from a typical large city beset with new, different and disagreeable problems, surrounded by groups, institutions, individuals and agencies willing and anxious to make all kinds of educational decisions.

Again, we must not assume that this departmental inadequacy is a midwest, a rural or a southern peculiarity. Let me recall to your attention the study made in 1961 of the New York State Department by Henry Brickell. McCleary and Hencly in their 1965 text on school administration describe the New York Department as "one of the best supported and best staffed departments in the nation," and then quote Brickell's analysis as "too small for the job it is attempting. In its efforts to supervise or to help about 900 school systems through direct contact, the Department is spreading its resources too thin. It assumes that it is performing functions which it cannot perform; it promises aid which it cannot give." Herein lies the relationship problem across the nation, expressed in another capsule form.

And what are the prospects? McCleary and Hencly catalog the eagerness of state departments to encourage innovation and change, the initiative they are taking in new educational developments and the assumption of leadership responsibilities. And with an apparent peek under the pedagogical tent they add: "Developments now under way may provide conditions for fundamental changes in the structure and role of these agencies (state departments) in matters of public education."

What are these developments? The most striking development, to me, seems to be The Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Public Law 89-10 of 1965. I believe I can faintly visualize the scurrying, the planning going on in your cities as you and your colleagues attempt to digest the legislation, devise the programs, find the answers, determine approved policies and secure the staff for this aid to the education of the educationally deprived children in the low income areas. Yours is the task of planning the proper use of a large part of the one billion dollars under Title I in fiscal '66; the $100,000,000 for library resources and textual materials in Title II, and for proper participation in planning and determining the best use of one hundred million dollars in Title IV. You will also be involved in the legally admissible and educationally desirable innovations under the one hundred million dollars aspirations of Title III. These are large amounts. May I recall for you that of the grants under Title I, 1 percent or ten million is reserved to the state agencies for the administration of Title I; that in Title II, 5 percent is reserved the first year and after that 3 percent of the one hundred million is allocated for state administration. Then Title V of the same act appropriates twenty-five million dollars a year for the strengthening of state departments of education. The official United States Office of Education language is interesting--language taken from the Senate committee report: "If American elementary and secondary education is to be both free and effective, state departments of education must be strong. The alternative to strong state departments is an educational lag and a default of leadership."

The prospects? The leadership stage in state departments of education, which started about 1930 in most states, will come to a dramatic end in the year 1965 or 1966. The state department thereafter will be new, larger, and quite different. The state superintendents and commissioners are scurrying, too, and are planning and devising even as you and your staff are. Disregarding the allocations for the administration of Titles I, II, and III, which will be used largely for the administration of those specific titles, most of the superintendents are looking at the allocations to their states in Title V to be used for strengthening their departments. Here are representative amounts:

California	$ 1,672,034	Maryland	379,359
Illinois	875,820	Massachusetts	477,050

Michigan	828,465	Pennsylvania	939,966
Minnesota	399,197	Texas	1,035,640
Missouri	460,057	Washington	372,829
New York	1,288,213	Wisconsin	415,673
Ohio	946,737		

These amounts will be allocated plus each state's share of $3,750,000 for the cost of experimental projects for developing state leadership. Yes, the stage of leadership which is now in effect will come to an end in 1965 or 1966 and in its place will come a new stage of leadership--Leadership with Adequate Staffs, or Leadership for All the State, or even Leadership in ways not now dreamed of.

I am not sure that I should have passed over so lightly the administrative funds allocated under Title I. After all, 1 percent of one billion is ten million. If my old fashioned mathematics is correct, that is about $700,000 for California for the administration of just that title; $430,000 for Illinois; $140,00 for Maryland, $268,000 for Missouri; $495,000 for Pennsylvania; and $900,000 for the state of New York, just to mention a few figures that are, I am sure, well known to you. In addition, the Title II allocations mean another $230,000 to Michigan; $100,000 to Minnesota; $110,000 to Wisconsin, and so it goes as the new legislation allocates funds to districts and to state departments for this new educational effort.

The prospects? I have been in touch with some state superintendents. What are they doing? They are looking for specialists of a kind undreamed of a few months ago--in some instances at salaries in excess of those being paid to the state superintendent; they are looking for curriculum people, scholars, consultants, writers, proven experts in many fields. Many are talking of surging forward in data processing, considering complete reorganization of their departments; all are having space problems, all are talking of tackling new areas of responsibility never before considered theirs, and without exception all are talking of greater and newer service to all their school districts.

The prospects? Do you remember Brickell's analysis of the New York state department and do you remember Commissioner James Allen's enthusiastic endorsement of that analysis which said of his department: "It assumes it is performing functions which it cannot perform; it promises aid which it cannot give." Surely, as departments analyze their own shortcomings, they will add personnel and plan services to enable them to do a better job for the districts they now serve under their present philosophy. And it seems logical to me that as they plan an extension of those services and the addition of new personnel, those services and that personnel might well encompass your schools to a far greater extent than is now true or possible.

Two things must be said immediately. First, you would not want it any other way. I have never had the fear of the U. S. Office of Education that several of my professional colleagues have had. But if there is to be planning, supervision, approval, and even auditing as there will be, each of you would prefer that all of these activities in relation to Titles I, II, and III should be carried out by the state agencies. In a program the size of Public Law 89-10, there is necessarily involved quite a bit of so called "red-tape." After proper federal guidelines and standards have been established, it would seem that the best procedure would be adequate and proper state administration. Secondly, it would seem to me that the superintendents or commissioners, as I know them, would be anxious to have your recommendations--what services would best help you, what personnel would best serve you, what organizational structure would be of maximum help to you.

The prospects? I think I can visualize the 20,000 state department staff members in 1960 growing to 40,000 in 1970. In what areas will that expansion come? Will it be in an expansion of the statistical aspects of the department, essential as those will be? Will it be restricted to the reports, the tables, the summaries, the projections, the applications, the addenda, and the approvals, necessary as all of these are? Will it be in the inspectoral segment with data submitted to the state department, to be run through the data processing machines, the computers, and the sorters? Will it be a refinement, a 1965 version of our historic statistical and inspectoral eras? Or, because of the fine professional cooperation of educators on the local, state, and federal levels, will there emerge a new concept of parternership and true professional leadership, appropriate to our times and our task? In short, will there be new state departmental concepts, services, staff members that will include you to a far greater degree? What will they be, what will they do, and how will they do it?

I see here a fine task for the organization of large cities or for the A.A.S.A. working with the Council of Chief State School Officers in the analysis of state department--larger city relationships and state department services to large cities--what they might be and how they might be extended. I see a task for each of you in your own state association of school administrators in working with your own state superintendent. I believe I can assure you that your superintendent will welcome your interest and aid.

But the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not the only newcomer to the educational scene. The Great Society is emerging on a variety of fronts, and many of the legislative proposals involve educational facets. Many of the large city systems are beset with new and bitter problems as boards and administrators operate with a citizenry, many of whom are very, very impatient, to say the least. The vast majority of these educational acts as well as the educationally related programs converge in the large cities. An educational magazine in June, 1965 listed 10 major sources of federal aid available to and affecting school systems. But in June nothing was known of the Teachers' Corps, the Fellowship program for teachers and the other new programs affecting education that have been announced since June of this year. Is there here a somewhat different and enlarged role for state departments--a new and invigorated relationship between state departments and large cities? Is there assistance not now being used completely by large cities --assistance in the state departments? Should there be assistance in the state departments, assistance not now available? McCleary and Hencly observed: "The major question to be answered during the 1960's is whether state departments can be restructured to lead educational improvements. There are encouraging signs."

My memory of twenty-five years as a local administrator and twelve years as a state superintendent recalls that in periods of genuine stress in the smaller school districts, the strong, right arm of the state department was often sought as a shield and defender. What about the large cities? Do the superintendents and boards of large cities like to defend themselves separately and apart from the state departments? Or are the state departments present in the bitter, emotional school struggles of our larger cities in a role not apparent to the by-stander's eye? Is education truly a function of the state, or is that state level function true only in the smaller school districts? Does education, even in and especially in the larger districts, need a more coordinated and a more emphatic voice on the state level--a voice to object, for instance, to further proliferation of educational activities; to remonstrate against more educational activities in the hands of non-educators; a voice to remind all and to insist that school districts are subject to state laws as well as to local, group pressures? Should the school districts of America, the statutory agencies for education on the elementary and secondary level, seek to clarify their role in these nationwide activities? In that clarification, is there a new task for a stronger relationship between the large cities and the state departments? The prospects? In my opinion, unless such new and stronger relationships are developed, further denigration and more trouble will ensue.

In conclusion, may I point to one very encouraging sign? I think I fully appreciate the scholarly contribution of our anthropologists, our sociologists, our social workers and our professional colleagues on our college and university campuses. I think, as a one time if a short time university professor of education, that I fully appreciate the absolute need for academic freedom. But I also appreciate, I think, the need for academic responsibility. In this decade of tension, of changing educational patterns in our large cities, I have worried over the attacks on school board policies, school board members and school administrators by some of our more vocal scholars across the country. I have wondered if they fully realize the inevitable slowness with which social agencies move and should move, and the statutory limitations involved. I have wondered if they all realize that school boards are the duly constituted agencies. I have wondered if the counseling of civic disobedience by some of these scholars is really sound scholarship. I have wondered if these scholars realize that opinion without responsibility is quite different than opinion in the face of responsibility. I have wondered if specific educational problems of specific groups are to overshadow and mute all other educational considerations of the decade.

So this kind of seminar is refreshing to me. Knowing my contribution would be minor, I nevertheless wanted to come--to congratulate Northwestern University in the effort of its School of Education, the effort to help education and administrators quietly and professionally. I think that in this kind of an effort, this one this week and other similar attempts, lies great hope. I trust that it will become a more common pattern.

I started by expressing a sense of inadequacy; I still consider my efforts quite inadequate. But I am glad to have been here and I do trust I have not marred the seminar too much.

THE PREPARATION OF LARGE CITY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Luvern L. Cunningham, Director
Midwest Administration Center
University of Chicago

One of the initial problems a writer faces in approaching a charge of this sort is deciding how to focus reflections effectively--how to select out of a vast array of possible observations those that are most relevant, most poignant, most thought provoking. My initial plan, since abandoned, was to build a case for the particularization of the preparation of administrators for large school systems on the grounds that administration in large systems is somehow unlike administration elsewhere.

The cities are reputed to be the centers of all that is bad with America. There are the slums with their deprivations, their Conant coined "Social Dynamite," their difficult schools, their demonstrations, their sit-ins, mess-ins, sleep-ins, picketings, and what have you. There are the aggravated problems of shortage: teachers, psychologists, books, pencils, chalk, even toilet paper. There are the dirty, dilapidated, foul-smelling school buildings. There is the need to protect teachers and pupils from the perils of their environment. There is the apathy of the adult community toward schools and what the schools are supposed to represent in American life. With this range of problems and issues, it would seem to take something special in the way of administrative talent and skill to cope with such demands.

One would be ill advised to ignore the gravity of the problems and issues confronting large city school systems these days, but at the same time one would err if he were to accept the premise that the problems and issues are so unique as to dictate a significantly different type of administrator preparation--or administrator, for that matter. Permit me to elaborate this point for a moment.

The image that the cities are the location of all that is wrong and evil in education and in society is distorted. To those who live and work in large cities this observation is so patently obvious that it need not be stated. To the hinterland or suburbanite professional or citizen it is not obvious, however, and they seem to take particular delight in finger pointing and reciting testimonials to their own innocence. It seems useful therefore, to place on the record from time to time the fact that large systems are extremely heterogeneous internally; that they have "good" schools and "bad" schools; that they have strong principals and weak principals; that there are genuinely interested parents as well as totally uninterested parents; that the neighborhood schools are more often than not the reflections of those neighborhoods; and that there are weak, ineffective, selfishly motivated teachers as well as strong, effective and completely dedicated teachers. Indeed, it can be said that the extremes which we find among suburban school districts can be found within large school districts.

By selecting out the large cities for special inspection we run the risk of further extending the current image of differentness. Thus, what is said here in reference to the preparation of administrators for large city systems can apply as well to those who are to serve in New Rochelle, Richmond, Evanston, Harvey, or Shaker Heights. Since our large cities as well as most of our small cities and suburban areas are so internally heterogeneous, it stands to reason that those with responsibilities for administrator preparation must accommodate patterns of preparation to such heterogeneity.

This decade has been marked by great "discoveries," scientific and otherwise. In 1961 James Conant discovered that there were some differences between slums and suburbs.[1] Accepting the substantial positive impact that Mr. Conant's thinking has had on the nation's schools, this discovery was not terribly insightful to the Hazletts, Pierces, Willises, Crouters, or Brownells. Also, in 1961 Patricia Sexton astounded academia at least with the findings that there were differential expenditures among schools within at least one large city.[2] Thus a second discovery was registered in the annals of educational history. In early 1964 here in Chicago a colleague of mine at the University of Chicago, Professor

Hauser, discovered that Negroes in Chicago were segregated and that, of all things, there were some all-Negro schools in this city.[3] Certainly this was a revelation equal to Van Allen's belt or Salk's vaccine.

One of these days, maybe before this seminar has run its course, someone will discover that the same problems and issues that harrass New Yorkers, Chicagoans, and the people of St. Paul harrass the people of Joliet, Massilon, and Pueblo. Jubilation will again surround us.

Certainly the problems of Joliet are as distressing to the administration and the school board and the citizens of that community as are similar school problems in Kansas City, Chicago or Newark. The intensity of feeling about problems of integration, school construction, improvements of physical facilities, and staffing is no less pronounced there than it is here in this city.

During recent weeks I have been holding some interviews with principals from suburban school districts and from inner-city schools. These interviews have been designed to elicit perceptions of the principal's role and to ascertain the extent to which principals in the suburbs and principals in the inner-city perceive their roles alike or different. The sample to date includes principals from upper middle class suburban systems and the most difficult inner-city schools and so far there appears to be little difference. Not only do these principals perceive their roles in similar fashion, but the problems which they face are much alike. The problems may vary in terms of the registry of citizen interest about issues in the schools and in the capacity of individual schools to marshall intellectual and financial resources with which to attack school problems. But there is little difference in the problems themselves.

General vs. Specific Learnings

Although many of my observations will be equally relevant to the preparation of the general superintendent of schools for large city systems, I prefer that my comments be applied essentially to the preparation of that large coterie of second and third echelon administrators which really carries the burden of a school system's performance. In Chicago, these administrators would be found in the principalships and assistant principalships at the building level and in the twenty-three district superintendencies.

In a sense I am dodging the knotting problem of the preparation of the general superintendent. I have chosen not to dwell on this position for several reasons: one is that the importance of the preparation of lower echelon administrators, in my judgment, supercedes the importance of the preparation of the general superintendent; another is that the time available for our discussion this afternoon might best be spent if we settled upon one group of administrators--recognizing that there are commonalities in need for both types of preparation. A third reason for focusing on middle and lower level administrative posts is that a preoccupation with the superintendency has diverted our attention from where it ought to be, and that is on the school as an organization and on the middle range administrative personnel who really make it go. I would be the last to diminish the importance of the general superintendency but I would be the first to create a place in the sun for the lower level administrative force. An over dependence upon one man, the superintendent, despite any Christ-like capacities, characteristics or values that he may possess, will not take us far enough. Our focus must be on the capacities of the school system as an organization to meet the expectations which are held for it.

If we admit to the similarities we must also admit to the uniquenesses which distinguish professional performance in the superintendency from that of lower level posts. There appear to be increasing evidences of uniqueness in the function of the superintendency and, concomitantly, in the expectations for the behavior of the superintendent. Thus, the preparation of the general superintendent should reflect the uniqueness of the superintendent's role. We have talked at length in conferences of this sort and through our literature on the school board-superintendent relationship. The important difference between this position and others within the school organization is precisely this relationship.[4] Similarly, the relationship between the superintendent of schools and the community at large varies somewhat from that relationship for other administrators at other points in the hierarchy. In my judgment, there is less difference of community responsibility between the general superintendent level and the lower levels than we may have supposed or indeed have recommended heretofore. Thus, I would state again that the important differentiation in function of the superintendent and other administrators resides in the relationship with the board of education.

These days it appears that no individual can run a large city school enterprise, or the defense department, or the Catholic Church. Thus, we must establish a new center for discourse on school administration and the preparation of school administrators--and that focus, it seems to me, can best rest on a school system's capacity to meet its expectations. To avoid misinterpretation, I am not suggesting the creation of a new type of "organization man" in the Whyte sense. I am suggesting that administrators of the future will survive most effectively if they develop an understanding of large scale organization, of organizational needs to adapt to changing conditions, and of functions of leadership and custodianship in organizational life.

It would not be appropriate for this audience to dwell unnecessarily on the particularities of preparation programs in terms of courses, seminars, field experiences, internships, residence requirements, research expectations, and other technical preparation program details of this order. (You may wish to raise questions about these later on in the afternoon.) The design of any administrator preparation program must hinge ultimately on the beliefs of its designers as to what school administration is all about. The designers must know what administration is, and they must deal equally with conceptions of what administration ought to become.[5] With this is mind, we should inspect some needs vis-a-vis preparation programs.

Some Reflections on Needs

From the perspective of one with responsibility for developing preparation programs, several needs occur to me and these comprise the major theme of this presentation. The listing which follows does in no way exhaust the range of needs which are worthy of our attention, but they do provide us with a point of departure for our discussion session.

(1) The need for cooperation between large city school systems and institutions preparing administrators.

Well developed cooperative arrangements between colleges and universities preparing administrators and large city school systems are rare if they exist at all. There are many examples of relationships such as graduate student field observations, internships, in-service seminars and workshops involving training institutions and school systems. But there does not exist, to my knowledge at least, a genuine partnership in preparation. If there were such a partnership, it would involve the following:

(a) extended conversations on the content and method of preparation;

(b) cooperation in the identification and selection of candidates for preparation programs;

(c) joint development of programs for field experiences;

(d) merging of training institution and school system resources in the examination of perplexing problems confronting the schools;

(e) cooperative development of experimental programs of preparation including research on outcomes.

Looking initially at the first criterion for partnership, it seems to me that training institutions have erred sharply in failing to involve school systems in refining programs of preparation. There was a short-lived flurry of discourse at the time of the implementation of the sixth year requirement for membership in the American Association of School Administrators. Since that time, however, little cooperation in building preparation programs has been in evidence. The training institutions have been accused of aloofness and an unwillingness to submit their offerings to scrutiny by men in the field. Practitioners, especially in the large cities, have questioned the relevance of what passes for professional preparation to the administrative problems and issues of the large districts. The time for joint examination of the preparation of administrators would seem to be overdue.

One of the most promising bases for initial cooperation is the mutual exploration of the problems of identifying high potential candidates for administrator training. For this aspect of a partnership to work, it would require much more than a few procedures or a telephone call now and then whenever it occurs to an administrator in the field to nominate someone for consideration by a training institution. Institutions and school systems must invest heavily in hard thinking about criteria for selection into training. A great deal is at stake because this is the initial, and in many ways the most important, application of "quality control" to the administrative capability of the school system. At this point, the training institution and the school system (the eventual employer) must come together on questions of philosophy, expectations, administrator models, and such mundane matters as experience, age, sex, personality, and intelligence.

Participation on the part of the school system entails a belief in the value of assisting with identification and selection of persons into training. It involves expensive staff time and a genuine commitment to the importance of such involvement. Participation in selection into training extends the school system's investment beyond the normal applications of quality control which most often begin at the point of selection into practice.

If an effective partnership is to be achieved, it suggests formalizing the process of identification and participating in the initial screening of individuals to be considered. The training institutions, to retain their integrity, must continue to decide finally which candidates are to be accepted into training, but they stand to benefit substantially from the insights of thoughtful school people. School systems stand to benefit ultimately through the availability of more competent administrative personnel.

The most prevalent type of cooperation today is related to field experiences, most often some form of internship. These programs have had their ups and downs with considerable variation in effectiveness from place to place and from time to time within the same large city system. Most designers of preparation programs these days place a premium on the structuring of field experiences as a part of the total preparation package. Despite the eloquent cases made for experience prior to acceptance into practice, there remain extensive uncertainties about how best to incorporate pre-practice exposures to the realities of administrative life into preparation sequences. Ramseyer concluded a recent UCEA volume on the internship with a list of six problems which for the most part are still unresolved:

(1) The determination of the function of the internship in the total preparation program;

(2) The determination of the precise nature of the learning experiences expected as a consequence of interning;

(3) The establishment of an appropriate laboratory for learning;

(4) The provision of appropriate guidance and supervision for the intern;

(5) The financing of the program;

(6) The evaluation of the effectiveness of the internship.[6]

Ramseyer's six problems could well be the basis for initial discussion between training institutions and big city school systems relative to an internship program. Each situation involving a large city and its coterie of training institutions is sufficiently unique that no ready made set of guidelines formulated elsewhere will suffice. Thus, the nature of these relationships will have to be created and, once established, examined periodically. Where several training institutions are involved, the refinement of general policy frequently runs headlong into institutional restrictions which somehow must be accommodated. The sticky issue of control over the internship is one which demands meticulous consideration on the part of each partner in the preparation process. School people, to wit C. Taylor Whittier, prefer control to reside with the school.[7] University people are ambivalent--yes if its a good situation, no if it isn't. The point is that the investment on the part of all parties to the internship is so substantial that it cannot be permitted to flounder. It must command the sustained attention of all parties to preparation.

A promising basis for partnership, largely unexplored, is the merging of training institution and school system resources. This is not a suggestion involving fat consultant fees for university personnel. It is rather an expression of hope--the hope that, in an exchange of confidence involving well intentioned parties, an intelligent approach can be discovered to the solution of serious questions. The concept of exchange of confidence is crucial, particularly in these days of stress and crisis built upon crisis in some settings. The university scholar needs the large city school system to further his research; the large city school system needs the product of the scientist's inquiry. But the relationship proposed here extends beyond mutual need in the sense implied in the preceding sentence. It involves, for want of a better term, dialogue--extensive conversation about the problems to be researched. The often described theory-practice dichotomy is frequently the product of limited communication between the inquirer and those most intimately associated with the phenomenon under investigation. A productive relationship of this sort must be based on freedom, trust and responsibility.

Large city systems frequently enjoy charter district status and thus possess privileges and freedoms not available to non-charter districts. They possess, for example, the right to determine teacher qualifications and standards for the selection of administrative personnel. With these privileges go opportunities for experimentation. Such freedom can become the basis for further extension of the partnership with training institutions. There is need for experimentation in matters of recruitment, selection, internships and other components of preparation programs. We are by no means certain of the value of teaching experience to administrator performance; thus, some large city might experiment with the identification of administrators at the time of employment as teachers with a view toward early entry into administrator preparation. Other large cities might try recruiting candidates for administrator training from other institutional sectors such as social work, health, and correctional institutions. Other cities may wish to assess the value of the internship by structuring an evaluative research design in cooperation with nearby training institutions.

Effecting cooperation is never an easy objective, whether viewed from the perspective of the school system or the training institution. The problems are complex, especially when several training institutions are seeking involvement with one large city system. The weight of sustaining the partnership itself may often be more than the parties to cooperation can support, especially since there are no legal obligations to do so.

(2) The need to examine our traditional conceptions about administration and administrative roles.

In order to develop some notions about the need for new administrative roles for today's large city school systems, it is necessary to review briefly how we came to have our present concepts of existing roles. We need to see the imprint of history on present administrative practice. Without this understanding, we will not be able to move very effectively from the limitations which some observers sense in our current performance.[8]

The formalization of the administrative function in schools is hardly more than a century and a half old. The formalization of preparation programs for educational administrators is less than seventy-five years old. The press for the particularization of preparation for school leaders as distinguished from the preparation of teachers was stimulated considerably by Elwood Cubberley of Stanford. Cubberley's impact, like that of other influentials, was spread broadly across the educational landscape. His observations about administration and administrators were the subject matter of the early efforts to prepare educational leaders. His writings reflect his keen sensitivity to the role of the public school as a significant force in the shaping of the nation. He acknowledged the growing complexity of America at the turn of the century and championed the idea that the school must rise to the challenge of change and perform new tasks in response to modifications in human life. In Cubberley's judgment the school was to provide the rudiments of learning and the preservation of national ideals; the school was to assimilate the immigrant, train the worker in new skills, abolish adult illiteracy, provide vocational guidance, create better national standards of health and cleanliness and instill in the people fair codes of morality. Indeed, whatever America seemed to need, the school was expected to provide. Let me quote briefly:

> No type of government of trained leadership at the top as has a democracy, and no branch of the public service in a democracy, is fraught with greater opportunities for constructive statesmanship than is public education. By it the next generation is molded, and the hopes and aspirations and ideals of the next generation are formed. To rise above office routine to the higher levels of constructive statesmanship is not easy and calls for a high type of educational leader.[9]

Cubberley wrote often about the school superintendent and he urged this person to be more than a trained bureaucrat and to assume responsibility for being the community's educational philosopher and statesman. He felt that a school administrator must have unquestioned moral character, cleanliness, temperance, honesty, honor, efficiency and manners, and that proper professional training was a prerequisite for a successful administrative career. His definition of proper professional training included special work in professional areas plus a good general education with emphasis on the social sciences and the humanities. He expected that administrators would have had some teaching experience and that entry into the profession of educational administration should be through lower level positions. He urged the young administrator to imitate the actions of famous men in educational administration, to build up his own professional library, and, most importantly, to evolve an educational philosophy conforming to the needs of society. Cubberley's instruction to the novice is worthy of note:

> It is now that the value of the long years of preparation becomes apparent. It is often said that only the man who is master of his calling, who overruns its mere outlines, and knows more about the details of his work than anyone else with whom he must work, is safe. Out of his large knowledge of the details and processes of school work, gained in the years of apprenticeship in

> his calling, and out of the guiding educational philosophy which he has slowly built up for himself, he can see ends among the means and hope amid the discouragements, and be able to steer such a course amid the obstacles and trials and misunderstandings of city school control as will bring a well-thoughtout educational policy slowly but surely into reality.[10]

And later on, in his landmark volume on public school administration, he admonishes the superintendent in this way:

> He (the superintendent) must not lose confidence in himself, for out of confidence in himself comes almost all of his other powers. Such confidence, if it is of the right kind, comes largely from a sense of mastery of the details of his calling. The world always steps aside to let a man pass who knows where he is going, but it often crushes the man who does not know whither he is bound. He must not repose too much confidence in other people. To trust subordinates and friends wisely, but not too much, is something he must learn.[11]

Cubberley classifies the duties of the superintendent. The first and most important task is to organize and formulate educational policy. By assigning the bulk of routine administrative duties and details to his subordinates, the superintendent frees himself for the work of developing long range educational policy based on what he (the superintendent) determines to be the needs of the community. Then the superintendent initiates action on these proposals. Cubberley even suggests how the superintendent should go about presenting his proposals to the board of education and the community. He offered that the most efficient way was to break down ideas into "bite-sized" units, make them palatable and easy to digest and then spoon feed them to the board and the community. He argued that if the superintendent were diplomatic, he would soon have everyone seeing the matter from his perspective. The successful superintendent would not encounter resistance, but, if resistance did appear, most objections could be managed through a friendly chat with the objectors.

The second basic responsibility of the school administrator was to act as the executive of the board of education. Cubberley maintained that, despite some legal notions to the contrary, the superintendent and the board were co-equals and ruled the school system jointly. He wrote, "it is primarily the business of the superintendent to think and to propose, and primarily the business of the board to sit in judgment on his proposals." It was the business of the administrator to lead and it was the business of the board to reflect the mood of the community at large. Thus, the superintendent was to persuade the board to accept his ideas; should the board resist, the superintendent was justified in making a direct appeal to the people.

The third basic responsibility of the school head was to supervise school operations. This task was concerned essentially with routine matters, and, as Cubberley suggested, the successful administrator was the one who could effectively delegate to lesser officials the immediate supervision of the technical aspects of school operation. In summary, Cubberley defined administration in the public schools as the work of ascertaining a community's educational needs, formulating educational policy based upon those needs, and implementing policies after having convinced the community of their righteousness.

Cubberley painted the responsibilities of administrators with a bold stroke. George D. Strayer, in contrast, tended to define administration essentially in terms of the application of knowledge and skills to school operation. He envisioned the administrator as one who possesses knowledge of the methods and results of recent scientific studies of school administration. Strayer, with his emphasis on large scale surveys, again emphasized the operation of schools as distinguished from Cubberley who emphasized the policy role of school administrators.

Franklin Bobbitt was influenced significantly by the scientific movement in business, commerce and industry. He was impressed with the efficiency concept and urged school administrators to develop definitive standards of performance and adequate measurements of performance so that the school would function in a business-like manner. He urged repeatedly that the management of school enterprises define clearly the ends towards which the organization was directed. Having defined those ends, management then was expected to coordinate the labors of all who were employed in the school organization to the attainment of those objectives. Management must locate the best methods of work and then enforce the use of these "efficiency" methods on the part of the workers. Although Bobbitt recognized the policy role of the administrator, his emphases repeatedly were a reflection of his adoption of the principles of scientific management from business and industry, and the application of those principles to the school enterprise. Bobbitt advocated activity analysis as the new technique for education, which was the transplantation of time and motion study in industry into the educational sector.

The influence of Strayer and Bobbitt on educational practice has been documented carefully by Raymond Callahan in his recent book "The Cult of Efficiency."[12]

Possibly one of the most profound leaders in the field of education and educational administration in the first one third of this century was Henry Clinton Morrison. Morrison was a hard rock New Englander who gave his life to the public schools. He, like Cubberley, was competent to serve as a spokesman for all of education, not only educational administration. His writings on the unit method of teaching have become classic. Interestingly enough, his observations about education included phrases which today are the subjects of dinner conversations. He recognized the impact of cultural deprivation on learning and was a shrewd commentator on the effect of out of school life on learning behavior. Morrison, like Cubberley, recognized the relationship between the milieu in which the school is embedded and the performance of the school itself. He advocated a vigorous policy life for the educational leader and held high the expectation for the school administrator in terms of the administrator's responsibility for influencing the direction of education in the policy sense. Morrison, like John Dewey, possessed an intuitive grasp of the nature of "publics." And if the schools' direction is to be desirable, leaders in education must be molders, shapers and transformers of the public will. Morrison appeared to be little impressed with the need for technical knowledge and supervisory perfection internally.

A more recent figure in the history of educational administration, and one cut somewhat from Cubberley and Morrison cloth, was Arthur B. Moehlman from the

University of Michigan. Moehlman combined an unusual gift for apprehending important social themes with superb insight into how schools could be operated effectively. He saw the administrator as essentially a service agent of the board and one who would look after such things as the physical plant, the finances of the school district, personnel, and internal administrative policies.

Paul Mort of Columbia should not be overlooked in any enumeration of significant figures in the development of educational administration as we know it today. Mort's impact on education has been described recently by Stephen Bailey in his monograph "Schoolmen in Politics."[13] Mort's influence on state level finance is well known. Few school administrators throughout the country are unfamiliar with his name and his views on education. Mort was a proponent of the development of "principles" of administration. He talked at times about a "rounded" system of basic principles" which administrators needed to become and to remain successful in educational administrative posts. He saw the heart of administration, however, as problem solving and much of administrative performance based upon common sense. Let me quote:

> We would expect therefore, that men of fifty would be much better at sizing up the culture than men of twenty-five. This is born out by observations of the men who are able and these are usually men of mature years. It suggests that the young man who is able to survive in the work of school administration to mature years must have had unusual insight or a streak of phenomenal luck which made it possible for him to succeed in spite of an inadequately developed conception of the general sense of the culture.[14]

Mort had great respect for the need to be efficient in the management of schools somewhat in the Strayer and Bobbitt sense. But he was not satisfied that the schools should accept society's definition of educational objectives without question. At the same time, he was not willing that administrators assume the total responsibility for establishing a school system's direction. He apparently saw less of a policy role for the school administrator than did either Cubberley or Morrison.

These are but a few of the shapers of educational practice as well as developers of programs of preparation for educational administrators. There are two predominant themes in the work of these men. One is represented in Cubberley's views in which he implants the expectation that administrators should run the show, including a large responsibility for establishing educational policy. The second theme seems to be an emphasis upon technical perfection in the performance of administrative duty. That is, administrators should be familiar with the technical functioning of the school enterprise, including general understandings of the problem of teaching and learning as well as administrative management.

The practice of administration and the training of administrators have been influenced profoundly by these men. Even the organizational structures of school systems are patterned after their suggestions and reflect the values of efficiency, the tight ship, and the professional control. Certainly the image of the superintendent as a key policy figure remains untarnished among most superintendents and is the dominant value communicated through our preparation programs.

Our school systems have retained patterns of organization and definitions of position at times long after they have outlived their usefulness. This condition exists partially because the present conceptions of positions are so intensively imbedded within the large bureaucracies that any shifts in definition are enormously threatening and resisted vigorously. Primarily, however, the training institutions are responsible, for they have not examined seriously better alternatives to present patterns of administrative organization and improved position descriptions. This leads to a third need.

(3) The need for extended research on big city school systems as examples of large scale organizations and inclusion of such research findings as content in preparation programs.

David Street[15] has observed that big city school systems are marked by an overriding "universalism." By this he means that many decisions are made through formulae and that there are infrequent opportunities for decision appeal or review. Furthermore, people develop a sort of automatic response and passive attitude of acceptance. I strongly suspect that Street is right, but I don't "know" that he is right. Probably there are wide differences in the extent to which individuals try to "beat the system." This is a promising research area.

Earlier I made the point that administrators of the future would need to know how to improve a school organization's capacity to do its job. Such technical skill will need to be built upon insights about the nature of the beast to be acted upon. Thus, the administrator trainee should become knowledgeable in relation to how decisions are currently made, how some decisions are made by default, how some personnel hide behind rules and regulations for security, how others make rules work for them, and how still others ignore policy in order to get the job done. In other words, we must train a new crop of administrators with a capacity to "beat the system."

Two examples of large scale universalisms which Street describes are the practices in some places of reproducing new units within the school organization (building, faculties, administrative staffs) as carbon copies of existing units and the practice of applying formulae and ratios uniformly throughout the school system. Obviously, the needs within a large city are not uniform and some ways need to be found to differentiate a large school system's response to needs. A proper focus of training, then, would be the study of differential responsiveness within large school organizations.

Large organizations frequently carry a heavy burden of tradition. Tradition can be an important factor in system building but it can be a substantial millstone as well. All school organizations large and small have informal power alignments that support the formal decision structure within the organization. We know very little about the dispersion of informal power within large systems; we ought to know much more. There are what might be described as loyalty systems which exist too--these may or may not be similar to informal power systems, but we know very little really about these. Again, we need to know more.

(4) The need for continued attention to the relevance of the behavioral sciences to administrator preparation.

The incorporation of the behavioral sciences into preparation programs has accelerated in the last fifteen years and reflects in part some of the above sensitivities. A basic assumption was that traditional patterns of preparation were linked too intimately with technical management responsibilities and too casually with understanding of human relations, group process, organizational structure, and political behavior. At the present time, many programs of preparation include work in anthropology, political science, sociology, psychology, and economics as basic components, contrasted with former programs which revolved around work in school organization, school management, school law, school facility planning, public relations, and school personnel.

The literature in educational administration and the emerging professional jargon stands in sharp contrast with the literature of a decade and a half ago. References are made from time to time to the "new breed" of school administrator. This is the bright young man type who has an advanced degree in educational administration and who counts among his course credits extensive work in one or more social science disciplines. His language is filled with phrases such as power structure, influence systems, social systems, change agents, cognitive dissonance, latent hostility, unanticipated consequences, constructive tension, role conflict, role ambiguity, and leadership style.

A concomitant and inter-related thrust of the past two decades has been the press for consideration of administrative theory. Several of the publications of the late 1950's and early 1960's contained impassioned appeals for the development of theory. This interest issued from the observation that practicing administrators have had little coherent theory upon which to base their administrative actions. One must hasten to point out that most of this concern has been expressed by people in academia and less often articulated by men in the field. The common cry from the field of practice has been that most professional courses have been much too theoretical in their approaches and have lost touch with the realities of administrative practice. Twenty years of interest in theory has produced remarkedly little, I would confess, beyond interest.

At present a student in educational administration at our institution has this to look forward to. He must develop general understandings in the broad field of education including the history, sociology, psychology and philosophy of education. He must likewise have some awareness of the practical expectations of school administrators, and must possess knowledge in school buildings, finance, law, personnel and so on.

Beyond this, we expect him to reflect considerable understanding of the history of administration (albeit a short history), the evolution of ways of viewing administration, and considerable work in the behavioral sciences along the way. We believe that a successful practitioner must have a broad understanding of education. Likewise, he must be aware of some of the "best ways" of operating schools in a technical sense. At the same time, and most importantly, he must be capable of diagnosing problems in the relationship between the school and its environment as well as in diagnosing problems of internal organization and management. His skills in diagnosis will rest heavily upon his understandings of social, political and economic behavior. The concepts which he can draw from the behavioral sciences are the tools for improved understanding of the environment in which the administrator finds himself as well as for his understandings of administrative performance.

In my judgment, the concepts from the behavioral sciences have more purchasing power than do our theories to date. For example, reference was made earlier to Street's use of the term universalism which is drawn from sociology and can be useful in understanding the response of employees to formal rules and regulations within school systems. When a school system applies a rule uniformly, there are often unanticipated consequences or side effects which issue from such application. Gouldner[16] has developed a simple model for analyzing organizational behavior which sets forth the notion of minimally acceptable behavior as one possible unanticipated consequence which can arise from the uniform application of rules. When a school system emphasizes the starting time for the school day--let us say each principal is asked to remind his teachers that they are due in their classrooms at 8:15 each morning--this notice may indeed reduce late arrivals but it may also affect teachers who have been in the habit of arriving on the job at 7:30 A.M. The early birds are made aware that they are out of step because they come so early, and some may cease to come before 8:15. These teachers are sensitive to minimally acceptable behavior and may actually reduce their personal input into their jobs.

(5) The need for the development of new definitions of the technical expectations for administrators.

One of the most prominent technical competencies expected of principals has been skill in the improvement of instruction. Erickson[17] has pointed to increasing tensions between teachers and administrators on matters of supervising instruction and urges a new role for the principal. He defines the new role as "strategic coordination" which is essentially an appeal for a combination of rational decision making and the artful harmonizing of the need to achieve the school's objectives and the demand to satisfy the personal needs of the people of the school. Erickson maintains that instructional supervision, so highly valued in the past, will become less and less necessary as teachers become more competent and submit themselves increasingly to the criticism of their peers.

My building level administrator of the future (he may or may not be called a principal) would be a specialist in the generation of information about his school and its performance. He may resemble somewhat the activity analyst that Bobbitt envisioned fifty years ago. This administrator would have the perspicacity to ask important questions about the performance of the school unit which he heads. His analyses would be directed toward the inputs of the organization as well as the outcomes. He would be creative in his applications of computer capabilities to the understanding of his school. He would in effect be a specialist in both data generation and data consumption. His decision making, as in Erickson's view, should become more rational. Whether his capacities to effect harmony can become more artful through training remains to be demonstrated.

It will be important for him to distinguish between innovation and change and to understand the circumstances under which an innovation becomes a change. The concept of "change cluster" may be useful in understanding more clearly the nature of the change process. For example, a school system's acceptance or rejection of a technical device such as an overhead projector is contingent upon the properties of the mechanical device itself, its perceived strengths and utilities, its introduction to professional and non-professional employees, the development of their skills in its usage, the modification in their attitude to substitute this technology for blackboards, chalk, maps, and other forms of visual presentation, the allocation of resources on the part of business administrators and school board members, the willingness to divert funds for its purchase from other potential uses, the arrangement of rooms physically to expedite its usage and to maximize its instructional potential, the adjustment of the learner to this form of stimulus presentation, and the consumption of time on the part of potential users in deciding whether this tool is superior to alternate choices. A breakdown at any one of these points affects the acceptance of this single innovation.

Again, as Street[18] has pointed out, large city school systems are primitive organizations in terms of handling data. When the day arrives that a large percentage of a district's middle level administrative personnel become superb data managers and analysts, we will begin to see sweeping changes take place. The traditional definitions of administrative role and attendant expectations may have to be set aside in favor of new roles, new definitions, and new expectations. It may be necessary to make our administrative superstructure more complex through further division of labor. At the same time as it becomes more complex, there will be the companion need for flexibility.

In Summary

This has been essentially a discussion paper in which five needs relative to the preparation of administrators have been developed. The five needs, restated briefly, were: (1) the need for developing partnerships of school systems and training institutions in the preparation of professionals; (2) the need for examining again our traditional conceptions of administrative roles with emphasis on positions of the middle range; (3) the need for extended research on big city systems as examples of large scale organizations and the inclusion of such research findings as content in preparation programs; (4) the need for continued attention to the relevance of the behavioral sciences to administrator preparation; and (5) the need for the development of new definitions of the technical expectations for administrators.

Implicit in these remarks has been an argument for closer cooperation in the preparation of administrators. Such an appeal stems from the feeling that substantial improvement beyond better administration will be achieved. New avenues for research will be discovered; better access to information will be found; improved utilization of research findings will result.

No reference has been made for in-service education, a need equally as great as strengthened programs of pre-service preparation. Much of what has been said is of value in thinking through questions of in-service, particularly references to partnership and role examination. Considerable invention is in order for this area; David Street has called for the appointment of training programs with training officers, patterned after military units, to fulfill the in-service needs of school systems.

Finally, there is need for extensive attention to the improvement of the structural capacity of a big city system to do its job. The administrator has the task of changing individuals and changing the organization itself. At present, large systems appear to be more reactive than anticipatory (to use another observation from David Street). Systems must develop system wide sensitivity; they must avoid responding crisis by crisis through the perfection of improved structural mechanisms with the capacity for anticipation. Pre-service and in-service professional education can make a contribution to this capacity.

Footnotes

1 James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961.)

2 Patricia Cayo Sexton, Education and Income (New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1961.)

3 Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago (submitted in March, 1964.)

4 Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.)

5 See Jack A. Culbertson, "Trends and Issues in the Development of a Science of Administration" in Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965) pp. 12-13.

6 John A. Ramseyer, "The Internship: Some Problems and Issues," in The Internship in Administrative Preparation, Stephen P. Hencley, ed., published by the University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio and The Committee for Advancement of School Administration, Washington, D. C. 1963, Chapter XI.

7 C. Taylor Whittier, "The Administrative Internship Program in Montgomery County, Maryland," ibid., Chapter X.

8 For a stimulating new appraisal of the principalship see Donald A. Erickson, "Changes in the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. XLIV, No. 5, April 1965, pp. 16-21.

9 Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States. (Boston, 1934) p. 479.

10 Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration. (Boston, 1916) p. 139.

11 Ibid., p. 156.

12 Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

13 Stephen K. Bailey, et. al., Schoolmen and Politics. (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962) p. 25.

14 Paul R. Mort and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1957).

15 From an address delivered by David Street, University of Chicago sociologist, to the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, New York University, 1964.

16 See the description of the simplified Gouldner model in James G. March and Herbert Simon, Organizations. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958) p. 45.

17 Erickson, op. cit.

18 Street, op. cit.

PERSONNEL PROBLEMS CONFRONTING LARGE CITY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Richard C. McVey
Professor of Education
Roosevelt University

The title of this seminar and the title of this paper bespeaks an orientation to our difficulties as school administrators and the aids to school administrators which merit some further explanation. It is customary and, indeed, almost a status criterion, that every difficulty be designated a problem. It is well to keep in mind that while a difficulty may only be an irritant with which we decide to live tolerably, a problem is a question for solution which has been imposed upon the irritating situation.

It is in this seminar that the impossible, unbelievable, but nevertheless quite real difficulties with which large city school administrators are confronted in the area of personnel shall become problems. The usefulness of our efforts depend upon certain abilities we may possess and certain procedures we follow in our attempts to define the problems and to suggest possible fruitful approaches to solutions. It is neither within the scope or the competence of this paper to inquire into the complicated interactions between the socio-economic-psychologic factors in our current history and the relentless maturity of a society faced with what may be its final chance to bring its practices into conformity with its ideology.

While it must be recognized in the equitable solution of any personnel problem that full consideration must be given to all the factors involved, it must also be recognized that personnel problems occur--that is, become irritants--within relatively small sectors of our society. The school is but one of the sectors.

Accordingly, we shall consider more fully those areas in our culture which interact most effectively to produce the personnel problems which plague every major city in the U. S. and not a few of the large cities of other nations in the

Western world where public education is being seriously promoted. I use the word "promoted" advisedly. I do not mean supported.

It is the major argument of this paper that the character and numbers of personnel problems now existing and the intensity of the disruption to education which results cannot be understood or approached unless careful consideration is given to three areas: (1) The nature of the urban situation, (2) the nature of the urban school system and (3) the nature of personnel in urban systems.

Cities are so familiar to all of us today that few of us have taken the time to assess their peculiar characteristics. The nature of the modern city is different in many respects from its historic counterparts, but in one respect it is most radically different. Dante was, in his own mind, a citizen of Florence. Like millions of his counterparts in Athens, Paris, London, pre-war Berlin, and Vienna, he lived in the city and there was a distinct identity to his city. Waking in his favorite hostel on the morning after a late arrival, the odor and hum of the activity along the Arno was definitely not the Seine's or the Thames'. Language aside, he was home.

With one or two dwindling exceptions, maintained largely by the imagination of travel-ad writers, what city in the U. S. is identified by any of us here as mine? For the most part we come to convene and leave to live our lives in some suburb. Those who do live here resemble the corpuscular activity of the body, moving randomly within the city. New Highways, blight, and renovation push them about. What used to be called the heart of the city is now known as the inner-city. The changing term is significant.

The analogy to life has been discarded and buried under a geometric symbol. The last nail in the coffin was driven when the Dodgers left Brooklyn. In short, Urbia now possesses Spengler's "fluid megolopolitan mass", anonymous, phrenetic, and brutal. A lonely crowd gathers when it can, around Mellon Square in Pittsburg or Rockefeller Plaza in New York amid what Mumford has aptly called, Standardized Chaos and Urban Devastation.

What is the connection between the real life of this Urbia and the schools which exist within its borders? What is pointed out as a good school by the dwellers in this city? Naturally, it is some suburban school in one of the many dormitory towns which now lie adjacent to almost every big American city. The pride of the small town in "our high school," justified or not, is now replaced by docile mobs led by militant demogogues and chanting slogans which announce that the schools are inferior--rarely do they say, "to what."

The anonymous relationships of the city make it impossible for the average citizen to recognize that half the marchers came into the city this morning from another city where yesterday they marched. Neither the marvels of communication devices centered in the city nor the vast centers of learning within their borders have enhanced communication between groups with diverse objectives. The marchers are more symptomatic than causative of the general social disruption.

In such an environment, what is the status of Education. Tremendous lip-service is paid to its supposedly magic formulae for curing all of the personal ills of man, from shyness on the dance floor at the age of 12 to economic disability at the age of 40, but what do the denizens of Urbia do about their public schools? To begin with, nearly a third of them send their children to private schools. Of the remaining two-thirds, it is necessary to maintain an ever-increasing force of truant officers to compel parents to send their children. Many socio-economic apologists can rationalize these two facts with the usual shibboleths of the day, but what of the "good" people in the city. Fairfax Cone, Trustee at the University of Chicago, provides an inkling. In a speech delivered at the Trustees Dinner to the Faculties on January 14 of this year, Mr. Cone spoke on The Conscience of the University and the part it played in the Hyde Park-Kenwood development:

> "What brings urgency to this moment is the shocking impact of a recent suggestion made publicly, here in downtown Chicago, that the needs of our public schools were, in reality, somewhat less pressing than the need for a new athletic arena for professional sports."

There has arisen in the city of 1965 a far more dangerous attitude than any expressed above. It is manifested in the increased frequency with which men of good will ask each other the question concerning the great public figures of the city. Why does he put up with it? Life is too short. Why kill yourself in jungle fighting if you don't have to do it? And with alarming frequency, competent and devoted men are deserting the operational posts in public life for the picket-free, press-free and tax-free incomes of private industry and government supported foundations.

This is the nature of the Urban situation today into which and out of which flows the resources and techniques of total control of our society. Within this milieu, what is the nature of the Urban School System? What of its control, its organization, diversity, or plurality, if you will?

First, to call any large Urban School complex a system is misleading. Webster says a system is "an assemblage of objects united by some form of regular interaction or interdependence; an organic or organized whole." Under this definition few Urban schools could be called members of a system. There is great diversity between schools in a city like Chicago. There is great diversity within the geographical and administrative sub-districts. Even the organization within the individual schools will differ greatly. As to interaction, it may be said to be minimal in spite of the impositions of Science Fairs, inter-scholastic competitions and multitudious bulletins.

What is usually implied by the term system has to do with the loci of control and power of and over the schools. Almost always what passes for such power is merely the facade of power, the panoply. The most independent and vigorous superintendent maintains his place in the facade by a shrewd and ruthless analysis of the real power structure--if there is one. Where there are many power structures, the superintendent's task is almost impossible. Other speakers in this seminar can, I am sure, speak with the painfully acquired authority of experience on this point. What is further implied by the system concept has to do with fiscal management, legal requirements and purchasing practices. These vary from city to city.

The schools in Urbia suffer from the impact of many of the salient characteristics of the modern city which we have seen. The patrons of public education are anonymous, even at the local school level, all too frequently. At best, the anonymity is diluted by some alphabetic designation such as P.T.A. or F.O.P.S. Understandably, the position of the school in the social life of the community suffers. However, it is still a place of greater interest to most subcommunities than the fire-house or the police station, and in many communities, certainly in Chicago, it is well above the local Social Security office in importance and interest.

It is in the field of the subject of this discussion that the Schools of Urbia are necessarily restricted. In matters of personnel administration, there is a necessity for the rigidity which rules impose.

The exigencies created by ever-present patronage demands in the political organization of the city, the economic demands on families with well-schooled but half-educated adult children, and the impulsive mobility of perverts, criminals and neurotics with degrees in education require rules which have legal validity only to the extent that they are impartially administered. Such impartiality frequently appears to be indiscriminate, arbitrary and punitive. These, in outline, are the inherent features which distinguish the school system in Urbia from its professional brothers in non-Urbia.

Our third consideration must include the nature of the personnel found in the schools and administration of Urbia. What are their dominant orientations to the profession? What are their values? What confers and maintains status in their society? Beginning with top administration, one gets the impression that those persons gravitating toward the top administration, or at least the top position in the schools of Urbia, have approximately the same involvement and commitment to a given school system as the president of General Motors has to Chevrolet if Ford would offer him a better deal. Those whose committment is to a given school system are a different breed. They are basically school-men in the best sense of the word. The first group are administrators in the best sense of that word. Many of them could administer a business enterprize with just as much skill and far more satisfaction than they feel where they are. They are like so many of us today, in the school enterprize, trying hard to prove that we, too, can be entrepeneurs. They are, as a group, familiar with, if not as skillfull in the use of, modern technical and administrative devices as their industrial and business brothers. Most of all they are consummate politicians or they do not survive in Urbia. And I would hasten to add here that "politician" is not a dirty word. What are the prime values of top-administrators. Survival.

The secondary level of administrators in Urbia tends more and more to be strongly oriented to the long term welfare of the system and the profession of education. He is often highly expert in a limited area of administrative competence. His nightmares are usually phrenetic involvements in the recovery of the pieces after the top administrator has been driven out, either by reason of his incompetence or his genuinely superior efforts. But among this majority are the local boys who are intent on making good, on becoming a prophet with honor in their own land. These are frequently men whose lives have been spent discovering the centers of power in the system and the approaches to its favor. They shift with the winds of popular pressure and constantly stop to support themselves against a post they pretent to be holding upright.

It is among the teachers of the schools of Urbia where both the greatest hope and the deepest despair for the future of education in large cities is found. The proportion and the number of teachers for whom the usual publicized values of education and good teaching are vital is still high. In fact, particularly among many of the younger teachers, it is higher than I remember it among those entering the profession at the time of my own debut. They are frequently well-trained even though inadequately educated. The proportion of women to men is still disturbingly high, and the proportion of women who enter to serve while awaiting their turn to provide a continuing supply of patrons to the schools is very high. Among the men, the proportion who enter teaching as a way station in the road to administration seems to be increasing in Urbia.

Nothing is of greater importance at the elementary and high school levels--so far as future recruitment of competent teachers is concerned--than the teacher's attitude toward teaching and his concept of his relationships within the profession. Does he regard himself as a day-worker, a job holder or a professional? Does he regard his supervisors as "one of the bosses" or as service staff who will assist and defend him in the prosecution of his proper professional duties? Does he believe that his worth as a teacher among his colleagues and administrative leaders depends upon teaching competence, academic achievement (both of himself and his pupils) and research contributions or in reports relating to imaginary statistics, courses accumulated and his human relations with non-teaching personnel?

A frequency table compiled from topics listed in the Education Index for 1963, comprising Volumes 34 and 35 and based upon 180 professional publications, produced the following interesting results. Articles about Teachers were second only to Education, but in a list of 30 Teaching ranked 16 and Personnel 26. The table would mean little to administrators if it were not concurrent with at least four of the largest teacher strikes in history. The problem of Teacher Unions will be dealt with in this seminar by a specialist in his field. It is an important element in the problems facing administrators and is purposely omitted from consideration here. Our immediate concern is with the factors generating such symptoms as strikes and unions.

What of the supervisory personnel in Urbia? Here I refer primarily to the position I personally regard as one of first importance in the school enterprize--the Principalship. Like all other aspects of the schools of Urbia, the caliber and quality of principals run the gamut from incredibly bad to unbelievably fine. Among the more than five hundred in Chicago's schools are hundreds whose focus on the needs of the pupils and their teachers is clear and sympathetic, who continually act as a buffer between teachers and non-teaching personnel, between teachers and pupils, between parents and teachers, and who never hide behind "the downtown office." They have pride in the job and satisfaction in their frequent professional successes.

Courtesy compels them to acknowledge as colleagues men and women who can't be bothered with administrative trivia like personal conferences with parents, teachers or children. These things they delegate, as a good administrator should, under their concept of administration. In a conflict between teacher and parent, teacher and pupil, or teacher and teacher their decisions are always oriented to the potential value of the decision to their own advancement. These people write copious and frequent bulletins. One I know was in a school three years and never attended a teachers' meeting. Teachers could see him only by appointment. Another stopped the dangerous practice of sliding down the bannisters in the halls by smearing iron colored glue and sand on the bottom of the bannister. A child's broken arm ended that stroke of administrative genius. Many operate businesses outside, part of which they conduct during the school day. One conducted a small loan business among janitors and non-teaching personnel. All of this latter group are willing to move upwards in the hierarchy as they conceived upward.

Given the nature of Urbia itself and its school systems and the derivations and nature of its personnel, what problems can be identified which plague the administrators of large city systems? At best we can only indicate the areas in which problems are likely to occur. The form in which they will be expressed can rarely be predicted. The human mind, seeking a method and means for its own discomfort, is incredibly fertile. We shall, therefore, give consideration to those areas of operation with continuing difficulties, and shall assure significance to the program of education rather than to those more spectacular deviations of people as people. The latter would be more interesting but less productive of the purposes for which we are here.

The problems relating to selection of staff grow increasingly critical. They center about two sectors: screening and placement. How shall adequate screening be accomplished in the schools of Urbia? The staffs of colleges, sometimes with the honesty of ignorance, recommend graduates who are not only detrimental to the educational process but hazardous to children. Superintendents of systems, where the applicant has failed miserably, are often loath to state the simple facts and so leave the personnel man in the big city to make inferences which may or may not be fair. Often the superintendent is in a state of mild euphoria at the prospect of never seeing the departing teacher again. Where contact with the surrounding suburbs and other big cities is good, there is some mitigation of this problem.

The real hazard of the possible dangerous teacher is that the methods for his detection, if applied, generally repel the able professional teacher who begins to wonder what he is getting into. For example, there seems little doubt that fingerprinting should be a part of every applicant's screening procedure in large cities. Most large cities do it. Murderers, child molesters, rapists and a host of other criminals have been discovered in cities where fingerprinting is standard procedure. But, the onus of the procedure in this country makes it distasteful, at least in theory, to many fiercely independent and competent prospects.

Small systems can, when gross incompetence is discovered, move with relative ease to dismiss a teacher, and further, they can do it with a minimum of injury to the teacher and the school. The process is not so simple in most city systems. The public press of most cities, being what it is, will give space to any teacher in inverse proportion to his intelligence and professional competence. It is rare that a competent teacher who is unjustly harrassed can get off the pages of educational journals, but the crackpot or the sad cases of hopeless degeneration are apt to provide a Roman holiday.

Closely related to selection problems, and frequently causing them, are placement problems. When all of the verbiage has been cleaned up, the simple fact is that good teachers want to teach students whose positive motivation to learn exceeds their negative motivation. Unless places are available for new teachers where they can have less rigorous beginning assignments, they will seek work elsewhere--either in or out of education. Even after initial screening and some experience, many teachers are marginal. If there is evidence of a desire to improve, the big city system is hard put to fit the assignment to the professional energy of the teacher--new or experienced.

This moves us directly into problems relating to stability of faculties. Veteran teachers want and should have the right to work where their competences can best be utilized, and they must be permitted a strong voice in decisions affecting that right. Large cities must set up procedures to implement this right. But as hordes of children negatively oriented to learning take over whole schools, teachers tend to seek more pleasant conditions. The dilemma is agonizing. On the one hand, the children in school which their presence has made difficult need stable competent faculties; on the other hand, teachers' morale is swiftly destroyed by devices designed to block their rational efforts to escape from such schools. It is not simply a matter of keeping experienced teachers in such schools. It is a problem of maintaining an organic and viable faculty.

The presence of large numbers of such schools in large city systems creates a parallel problem which is often overlooked. This is the problem created in the schools located in better neighborhoods by faculties that have become too stable, sometimes to the point of rigor mortis. Children who have received all of their early education in such schools know, with the irrefutable logic of experience, that there are no teachers under 50 years of age, except practice teachers. This takes us to the problem of recruitment.

Recruitment, by definition, is the procurement of new growth, not simply the addition of bodies. The young man or woman who enters a teacher education program was recruited for the profession, in most cases, well before graduation from high school, unless teaching is a stop-gap job for them while they develop other marketable skills or marry. But recruitment to a given system is a matter which involves the total image of that system. This image is created, in part, by the public media of communication, few of whose practices are designed for any purpose except ultimate pecuniary profit. If there is a conflict or a catastrophe concerning the schools, newspapers and television are interested. If not, "it isn't news." Young, professionally oriented teachers with well integrated personalities want challenge, but they don't want the sordid and bizarre which is the stock our communication media sell.

But among these young people are a number of dissidents, often sincere but congenitally unhappy souls. They want to come to the big city. They are attracted, not only by its anonymity, but by the opportunity the classroom offers as a forum with a captive audience. Here they hope to spend the art period making posters which their pupils will carry on the day they boycott the schools. Here they teach their social studies classes the practical side of freedom of the press by assigning some book like Fanny Hill. In the ensuing uproar parents, administrators and the cossack police become indiscriminately lumped together as the bad guys. The imperturbable principal who asks such a teacher, "What behavioral change were you seeking in your pupils?" becomes a middle-class reactionary. The press and the TV interview the teacher and seek to interview the administration. What new growth came with this teacher?

A recent French critic of the American college alleged that the real life of American college professors was elsewhere than in the campus of their schools. Rarely, said he, could they be found walking leisurely with their students in serious but relaxed discussion. I do not know how true his statements are, but in the public schools of large cities there is little opportunity for teachers to identify with each other in the school. This aid to maintenance and improvement of professional quality is missing. In the short periods teachers have to talk--if they are not engaged as hall guards, lunch supervisors or other non-teaching duties--they are usually involved in small talk. Their real life begins after three P.M. Sometime after this or during the summer they may, according to formula, complete the equation: Degree plus x number of courses = $500.00 annually. But the problem of developing the kind of professional improvement which comes only from bruising one's brains against those of a respected colleague remains unsolved. In most large systems it is functionally ignored.

Promotion in the schools of Urbia creates the same frustrations for individuals and the same misgivings to administration that it does anywhere else in Urbia where the competitive struggle conceals only slightly the fang and claw. Here, as in other areas, the nature of the urban situation reinforces the negative forces which beset the administration. It is in the personnel function of promotion and promotional policies that the school board of Urbia frequently involve themselves. To many members of these boards, the position is a stepping stone to political prestige and, sometimes, office. Offices are attained partly through powerful friends. The crass methods of the early part of this century are rarely involved, but the results are visible to all the staff.

Even given the most honest board and the best administration, the problems of executive development and adequate appraisal remain especially difficult. Tacitly or explicitly, an informal quota system becomes operative. The so-called minorities think of promotions in the staff rather like two Irishmen discussing the results of an election of officers in their union. The union consisted of 150 members, 145 Irish and 5 Swedes. The Swedish candidate got 5 votes. The Irishman commented, "These Swedes are clannish, aren't they?" Delegations of this and that society of hyphenated Americans wait upon the Superintendent to express their interest in this or that member of the staff for a position which is open. More powerful groups don't bother with the Superintendent; they get one or more of their own racial, national, or religious persuasion on the board and from there on he carries the minority ball.

This problem, which seems even to its creators to be a matter of the ancient desire to see "one of our boys make it," really exposes a far more serious problem with which administrators in Urbia have to cope. This is the increasing pressure to consider the schools of Urbia primarily as job reservoirs for the more genteel economic or social incompetents who happen to be unemployed. In a recent speech to the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, a top official of the U. S. Employment Office militantly announced that if it were not for our antiquated certification laws there would be no teacher shortage. His office could supply thousands who could do the job. Whatever the motivation of this gentleman, he reflected, all too well, the pervasive and corrosive notion that anybody can teach and, of course, anybody can supervise anybody who can only do what everybody can do.

A recent hubub arose over the failure of some discriminating school systems to hire people who had taught in the Peace Corps. I have not heard one complaint that persons serving in the medical groups cannot be licensed as doctors on the basis of their unsupervised application of prepared band-aids. The diparity between the application of experience as a criterion of competence in medicine and teaching speaks for itself. However, the critics of the selection and promotion procedures current in the schools of Urbia have touched on another difficult problem facing administrators in those schools.

Rules, regulations, certification and rigid mechanical screening procedures are almost a necessity, as we have seen. We have also seen that differences between schools and the needs of schools within a metropolis may be far greater than those differences discernible between two schools in adjoining suburbs or even between towns hundreds of miles apart. The historic background of a moribund school or whole department in a large school system may demand the infusion of new administrative blood. No top administrator can tell in advance whether the infusion will produce more antibodies and subsequent coagulation than already exists. What he can be sure of is that unless the forms and procedures which time has codified and sanctified are carefully observed, he and his board will spend endless hours and great sums defending his actions in the courts. Rarely does the educational consequences of the administrator's original decision come under attack. Nearly always, his failure to pay proper obeisance to the local prejudices is the source of his discomfort.

This problem of maintaining a workable balance between necessary legal rigidity and equally necessary professional flexibility will likely become one of increasing tension. Marginal and experimental educational programs heavily financed by Federal funds and employing academic crossing guards on a temporary basis are apt to strengthen rather than weaken the notion that anyone can teach. Increasing numbers of people who have been to college and find difficulty obtaining regular employment will build pressure to put them on the public payroll. This latter group already know, with the irrefutable certainty of ignorance, that they could have graduated from college if they'd only had good teachers in the public schools and college instructors who understood them. Add to this group the marginal students who have been steered out of Liberal Arts into what many professors regard, not too privately, as the proper place for the well-muscled or kind hearted--the school of Education. Unfortunately, many of them have been given degrees and they come, with unerring instinct, not to the doors of the suburban schools but to the schools of Urbia. In interviews with dozens of these persons who were unable to pass examinations or who lacked even the minimum competence necessary to teach, there is an appalling number who defended their pursuit of a teaching position on the grounds that they are really seeking an administrative post and needed the experience "for the record."

To complicate the administrator's promotional problems further are the evaluative procedures. The anonymity which blankets Urbia also covers the true meaning of such "grades" as Satisfactory and Superior. Who gave what grade based on what criterion? No administrator in Urbia can hope to evaluate the validity of an appraisal without looking at who made it. The informal organizations criss-cross in every possible direction and the best formal organization and the most carefully contrived program of mobility cannot completely obliterate the frequent coloring of the facts necessary to justify promotion.

One of the most recent additions to the life of the administrator in a large city is the Teacher Organization. Until relatively recently, this was an aspect of school life which concerned the administrator once or twice a year when he was invited to speak to the assembled members. With the increasing impersonality of Urbia and its school organization, unions developed. The implications of the increasing militancy of Teacher Unions will be dealt with much more fully in this seminar by Mr. Wildman. On this point I am primarily concerned with pointing out the inevitability of the rise of some sort of focusing device for the complex and increasing insecurities felt by the teachers of Urbia. Here, under one garish side show tent of educational activity, can be gathered the serious, sensitive scholar, the world-saver, the neurotic, the school teacher turned politician, and the organizer of planned confusion.

While there seems to be little doubt that the great impetus to the teacher union movement stems from the failure of administration to give the teacher an identity, the recent wave of teacher strikes indicates a new kind of teacher leader --opportunistic, ruthless and, at heart, a despiser of the professional teacher.

I have made only the sketchiest outlines of the critical problems which face administrators in the area of personnel. I would like to suggest consideration of research in several areas which might prove fruitful:

1. Selection or recruitment, particularly of principals, with emphasis on the fact that all selection implies rejection.
2. Identification of criteria for selection or rejection.
3. Identification of criteria for competence. Here, we must explore not only what actions are common to good teaching, but what are the means by which we know these actions are better than others.
4. The relation of general education, with its patterns of life-long curiosity and inquiry, to teaching success.
5. The psycho-dynamics of teacher satisfaction and its relationship to the rise of militant unions.
6. An investigation, involving other than teachers, of the personality factors in the prospective teacher most likely to suffer under the conditions

which have become general in megolopolis. Here I refer to crowding, in all its forms, both static and mobile; anonymity; and other forms of institutionalized alienation.

The specific research these items suggest could well involve the administrator and the basic sciences of education as well as the university investigator in Education. It is my sincere hope that the current frustration and despair which many administrators feel may be mitigated by the application of intelligence to their problems about most of which we have not yet even assembled accurate data. Like Houseman, many of them must end each day with this verse:

And how am I to face the odds
Of man's bedevilment and God's?
I, a stranger and afraid
In a world I never made.

TEACHER COLLECTIVE ACTION IN THE U.S.: 1965

Wesley A. Wildman
Director, Labor-Management Projects
Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago

A couple of years ago, when I first began speaking on the subject of collective action by public school teachers, I noted that as a student and practitioner of traditional private sector industrial relations I was thankful that our increasingly dull and drab vocabulary was receiving an infusion of color and verve from the teacher bargaining scene. I was making reference at that time to the charge of the American Federation of Teachers that the negotiating activities of National Education Association affiliates constituted "collective begging" rather than collective bargaining and the characterization of legislative provision of duty free lunch periods for teachers as "right-to-eat" laws. I also noted the American Federation of Teachers' newspaper styling of the resolutions concerning collective activities by teachers passed at the 1963 National School Board's Convention as "redolent of the medieval divine right of kings." Well, the trend, I am glad to report, of colorful phrase-making in educational employer-employee relations has continued. At least one teacher bargaining contract now contains a "chicken-pox clause;" New Jersey passed a "right to hit the kid back" bill in its state legislature, which, in other jurisdictions lacking legislative provision for this dubious right, will undoubtedly become a subject of collective bargaining; and, quite recently, the Detroit Education Association has charged the union with, and I quote, "collectively bungling away the opportunities to improve teacher working conditions."

In a more serious vein, now, I'm going to attempt to touch briefly the highlights of the crucial elements and issues relating to the teacher bargaining scene as I view them at this moment.

The facts and figures concerning current developments on the teacher bargaining and professional negotiations scene are probably quite well known to most of you and I think that the sketchiest sort of summary will suffice here. The membership of the AFT is now approximately 110,000 while the NEA claims around 950,000 members at present. The important thing to note here is that the AFT has been growing at a rate of 10,000 or better per year over the past several years and is beginning to better, if only slightly, the rough 10 to 1 ratio which has existed for more than a decade between AFT membership and direct NEA membership. The majority of the AFT's strength is, of course, in our major cities. Another important consideration with regard to the numbers question is the fact that over 90 percent of the nation's teachers are enrolled in either the NEA or state and local affiliates thereof. This, of course, gives to the NEA and its affiliates a large edge over the AFT in terms of financial and organizational potential. In elections which have been occurring with increasing frequency between AFT locals and NEA affiliates in the past couple of years, it would appear that since 1963 the NEA is ahead in terms of total victories won. However, the AFT wins, including those in Detroit, Philadelphia and Cleveland, give the overall edge in terms of teachers represented by the Federation.

The catalogue of recent election, organizing, strike or sanction, and bargaining activity by the two successful, competing organizations is an impressive one; I'm not going to take time to recount it here, as I'm sure you're quite aware of it from even the casual reading you may have done.

The incidence of collective activity among public school teachers on the local level is clearly increasing, and it seems evident that the essential thrust and desired effects of the attempts by teacher organizations to assume greater power in the local system is shared control over policy formulation and administrative decision-making in areas traditionally considered the unilateral responsibility of boards and administrators.

Why the ferment, or, if you will, revolution?

Now, I have written, and others before me, of the possible inherency of some degree of conflict in the teacher's "employee" as distinguished from his "professional" role in the average bureaucratically organized school system. Briefly, I have noted first that teachers, like most others, wish more material rewards for what they do and that this may put them in conflict with their board and/or the community at large and lead to the desire for more power to wield in that conflict. The Community *may* be primarily worried about the tax rate and less about the needs of education. The school board *may*, in some instances, reflect community attitude and the chief administrator *may* be at least as interested in efficiency and minimization of cost as he is in quality education. *Second*, it appears that with regard to the non-welfare items in the teacher employment relationship there is a "web of rule" in schools (regulations concerning class size, number of assignments, program preferences, seniority, service and merit increases, promotions, etc.) which teachers may well desire to share in formulating. Also, they may feel a need for a formal and protected method of protesting allegedly discriminatory application of rules and policies. This desire or need of teachers in some school systems for comprehensive rules to guide the conduct of administrators and for a grievance procedure through which to process alleged misapplication of those rules is quite analogous to one of the prime motivations of industrial workers to form and join union organizations. Now clearly, these potential points of conflict will be more in evidence in some school systems than in others and generalizations must be heavily qualified depending on such factors as the board's behavior, styles of administrative leadership, differences in size and degree of bureaucratization of school systems, varying orientations of teaching staffs depending on geography, recruitment practices, age, sex, marital status, etc., and last, but not least, community and environmental factors.

I have concluded that the recent increase in the incidence of teacher collective activity has resulted from this sort of conflict present in some systems, operating in conjunction with a number of historical factors such as the following:

1. The increase in government employment which is creating pressures for enabling legislation at the state level to provide organization and bargaining rights

of which teachers can take advantage, and, in addition, simply the example which ever more widespread bargaining throughout the public employee sector of our economy may be providing for teachers in our systems.

2. The support for teacher organizing activities which is arising out of the desire of the larger labor movement to organize the white collar workers of the country.

3. The pressures developing as a result of the problems of the large city school systems are important. More of the hard to teach, over-crowding, insufficient tax funds, etc., have resulted in the fact that dissatisfaction among teachers in the larger system is in many cases simply greater than in the suburban or rural systems. Giving, as I do, central significance to the situation in New York as an initiator of much of the ferment we are observing today, I would note that the NEA response to the AFT challenge, which began so dramatically with the Union's successes in New York, appears to have become an independent causal factor of great potential significance which will stimulate further collective action among public school teachers insofar as that NEA response increasingly consists of a widespread and active promotion of a program of power consolidation, negotiation and shared control at the local level.

4. The increasing educational level and "professionalization" of teachers in the United States.

5. The long-run increase in the percentage of males in the teaching force and a decrease in turnover within the profession.

Well, at least some of these causal factors, and undoubtedly others as well, are responsible for the fact that some form of interaction, not necessarily negotiating or bargaining, between teacher organizations and school administrations and boards prevails in a vast majority of at least the 6,000 largest school systems in the U. S. (those with over 1,200 student population). Narrowing the issue, the AFT and NEA together claim to have achieved recognition in over 500 school systems. AFT locals appear to have achieved agreements in about 15 to 20 school districts, mostly in the larger urban areas or in highly industrialized and unionized smaller communities. NEA affiliates have about 200 professional negotiation agreements which provide for more than recognition out of a total 400 plus agreements. Only a very small percentage of these contain substantive provisions regarding salaries or other conditions of employment. Nearly half of all NEA agreements appear to be in school districts on the West Coast.

Under the impact of comprehensive law and extensive experience, collective bargaining relationships in private industry have come to display great uniformity. In the absence of comparable law and experience in public education, school board-staff negotiating relationships display diversity in even the most basic elements of the relationship. For example, where in private industry exclusive or sole recognition of the union is universal, relationships in public education have produced an amazing number of alternative forms of recognition including official recognition, recognition as a spokesman for the staff, majority recognition, minority recognition, substantial recognition, formal recognition, informal recognition and certified recognition.

It is possible to detect some common elements in the diversity which characterized school board-staff negotiations and to identify some common phenomena, problems or issues. Three such elements deserve some treatment in this context: the structure of negotiations, the scope of negotiations, and the closure in negotiations, or what you do in the event of impasse.

Structure in Negotiations

The key variable in the structure of negotiations seems to be the role played by the superintendent. In practice, three distinct structural types seem to have appeared and all have been formalized in written agreements.

The first structural type is negotiations directly from the outset between the school board and the teachers' organization.

A second structural arrangement involves what may be termed tripartite negotiations. In this case, the superintendent is called upon to act as a third force in the school board-staff relationship. The exact nature of this "third force" role can best be seen through the wording of some of the agreements. In some cases negotiations are to be conducted through a "committee of the whole" including the board, the superintendent and the representatives of teachers. Other agreements call for the superintendent to act as ". . . a channel and interpretor of teacher concerns to the board and of board of education responsibilities to the teacher," or to assume the responsibility ". . . to both teachers and the school board to clarify issues and to stimulate all concerned in keeping the best interest of the total school program as the basis of discussion."

The third structural type calls for the superintendent or his representative to conduct negotiations, at least at the outset, in his position as chief executive officer of the board. In all but a few of these situations, the teachers' organization enjoys the right to take their case directly to the board of education if they fail to reach agreement in negotiations with the superintendent. In this case there would be a strong incentive for the teachers' organization to take all matters to the board as long as the board will bargain as opposed to simply hearing their presentation on the assumption that the superintendent is right until proven wrong.

What do these various structures imply for school boards, school administrators and the relationship between boards and administrators?

As I have discussed in detail in writing elsewhere, I am quite convinced that where collective bargaining is the order of the day in a school system, if the superintendent is to be an effective leader in his school system he must have both working responsibility for an authority over the collective relationship with the teacher group. The concept of the chief administrator as a "middle man," interpreting the teachers to the board and the board to the teachers, providing information, counsel, and mediating services to both during the bargaining process does not seem to me realistic or tenable. It seems at least possible that one result of the establishment of bargaining procedures which provide for direct access to or involvement of the board from the outset of negotiations may be the compromising of the superintendent's leadership position and a weakening of the proper degree of autonomy and freedom which he may legitimately enjoy within his system with regard to matters of professional expertise and administrative authority. In any event, there is growing evidence that the boards which have experienced the process do not consider the conduct of detailed negotiations as either appropriate to their general fiduciary policy-making function or practical from the point of view of time consumed.

While there is inevitably some conflict between the role of bargainer and that of first teacher, it is probably not impossible for the strong superintendent to wear both hats.

In large school systems it may be unreasonable to expect the superintendent to conduct the negotiations himself. Expert help may not only be desirable but necessary. This situation is not, however, to be differentiated from the case in which the superintendent does the bargaining, for it is the location of the responsibility for the negotiations which is crucial. Assumption of this responsibility demands that communication between the superintendent and the board be excellent if the superintendent is to enjoy sufficient authority to bargain and thereby make it unnecessary or impossible for the teachers' representatives to circumvent him in favor of direct interaction with the board.

An often overlooked but equally important aspect of the superintendent's bargaining role is his relationship with other members of the administrative staff. Communication with them may be vital in the development of rational bargaining positions on essentially administrative issues. Furthermore, a sense of participation in the negotiations may be crucial for those who must live with, administratively, the results of negotiations--for example, principals. In the large system, it is the principal whose authority is most immediately and directly challenged by the advent of the bargaining relationship, and who must interpret and apply day-to-day an agreement he had no role in making.

Scope of Bargaining

Teacher negotiation agreements in existence today are concerned for the most part with recognition and procedures for negotiations. Where such agreements do include substantive provisions regarding conditions of employment, salaries are about the only item which appear with any great regularity, followed by grievance procedures. With the exception of the New York agreement and just a couple of others, little has been included in teacher negotiation agreements regarding working conditions--subjects which comprise the bulk of labor-management contracts in private industry.

Specific contract provisions and bargaining demands from some of the negotiation relationships do provide a limited basis for approaching the questions of the scope of bargaining and the dimension of conflict. A few suggestions from the population of demands and agreement provisions should serve to give some indication of the potential in this area.

First, what is the appropriate overall support level for the school system? Should a fiscally dependent school board submit a budget request which reflects all the true needs of the system or should it submit a realistic request which reflects its estimation of the financial condition of the superior political unit? Should a fiscally independent school board tax up to its legal limit or should it endeavor to maintain a margin of safety in establishing its tax rate?

Second, how are available funds to be divided among alternative uses? Are textbooks, building maintenance, adult education or teachers' salaries more important to the improvement of the educational process or system?

Third, to what extent should teachers' salaries be increased at the bottom of the schedule as a means of facilitating recruiting as opposed to increases at the top as a means of rewarding long-service teachers and facilitating the retention of teachers in the system?

Fourth, to what extent should seniority be used as a criterion in transfer, promotion, assignment and layoff of teachers? Is organization membership a valid criterion or consideration in such decisions?

Fifth, to what extent should teaching and non-teaching assignments be strictly rotated as a matter of policy among all teachers in the interests of equity within the teaching staff?

Sixth, to what extent should the length of the teaching day and the use of teacher free time be uncategorically limited as a means of protecting teacher rights? Should a teacher be able with impunity to walk out of a faculty meeting after some predetermined length of time?

These are all questions which have been dealt with directly or indirectly in teacher negotiations. They were selected from the totality of such issues because they represent questions which do not appear, at least on the surface, to be subject to clear, rational, empirical determination. There is clearly room for differences of opinion between teachers and school boards and school superintendents on such issues. Each of the parties may clearly bring a different perspective to bear on any of these questions. For example, on the question of level of support the school board may reflect the attitudes of a tax conscious community, the superintendent may be concerned with long-run development needs of the system, and teachers' may desire more salaries or better facilities in the short run.

Boards and administrators about to begin negotiating with teacher groups are often concerned with the question of what they can, should, or must bargain about. The essentially political nature of the legislative determination and control of salaries and many other terms and conditions of employment in the public sector makes this question acute in most jurisdictions and raises for some, of course, the whole question of the applicability of bargaining to public employment. In some of the teacher negotiating situations we have studied, the administration, at least, if not the teacher organization, seems confident that headway has been made in defining those areas which will remain "managerial prerogatives," not subject to bargaining and those matters which, on the other hand, are fair game for mutual decision-making at the bargaining table. However, understanding of the dynamics of any union-management relationship which demands an ever-increasing scope for union action and concern, experience with the constant proliferation of the concept of "bargainable subject matter" under the law in our private sector industrial relations system, and recognition that teachers, because of the nature of their professional employment relationship with the school system, are concerned with and knowledgeable about a vast range of the school's problems and activities, do not make one confident that hard and fast rules as to what is negotiable and what is not are likely to be quickly forthcoming on the teacher bargaining scene.

Impasse Resolution

The use of power in negotiations is a matter related in what may be termed closure of negotiations. In private industry, if agreement cannot be reached by the parties, they must ultimately resort to a test of power or the threat of it. As long as the underlying community of interests between the parties is greater than the conflict, this test of power produces not total war to the finish but an accomodation.

Teachers are, of course, denied the right to strike by law. They have not, in all cases, however, relinquished this right. In private industry, the employer's counter weapon to a strike is simply his right to refuse to offer employment on the terms demanded by the union--to take the strike. At least this was true until the recent Supereme Court decision. In most cases, boards of education, while having the same counter weapon reinforced by the illegality of the strike itself, have not felt able to use it despite the fact that they suffer financially in no way comparable to the private employer. This does not imply that strike-busting should be an appropriate activity for school boards; rather it simply states the dilemma faced by school boards whose teachers do strike.

The only way out of this dilemma is to find an effective alternative to the strike--to eliminate any moral basis or need for strike action. Such alternatives have in some cases been imposed by law or adopted voluntarily by the parties to a school board-teacher negotiating relationship. For the most part these impasse resolution procedures involve the traditional techniques which have been applied in the private sector--mediation, fact-finding, or combinations thereof into multiple step procedures.

We have explored briefly the structure of negotiations, subject matter and impasse resolution procedures which are developing in some of the more or less formal or, if you will, "advanced" negotiating relationships between teacher groups and boards. To date, though, there are relatively few instances where teacher groups sit at the negotiating table with something approaching an equality of power vis-a-vis the board or administration and practice formal collective bargaining. Most of the present forms of interaction between teachers organizations and boards on the local level are much less than true bargaining and have been characterized as the "white cane approach" or "organized supplication." But now, on the assumption, not necessarily provable at this point, that taken together, the bias in our society toward bargaining, the fact that there is a growth potential in that direction which is "built in" in any more rudimentary form of collective relationship, and legislative developments may result in an evolutionary drift toward mature bargaining in the schools, I want to say something about the significance and meaning of bargaining.

Now, the theory and practice of collective bargaining are based first, on the assumption of significant and continuing conflict between the managers and the managed in any enterprise, and second, on the corollary assumption that there will be a strong, identifiable community of interest and consensus within the employee group with regard to large numbers of items and areas of judgment on which there will be conflict with the managing authority.

Collective bargaining, as it is practiced in industry, and at least in some school systems we have studied, is essentially a power relationship and a process of power accommodation. The essence of bargaining is compromise and concession-making on matters over which there is conflict between the parties involved in the bargaining. The engine which makes the bargaining relationship real and bona fide is the right and ability of each party to inflict loss on the other in the event of failure to reach agreement as to how they shall live together for a specified period. The avowed theoretical purpose and practical effect of collective bargaining is to grant to employee organizations an increased measure of control over the decision-making processes of management. While such problem-solving may take place in negotiations, particularly at the inception of a bargaining relationship in public employment, true, mature collective bargaining in either industry or in school systems is much more than an elaborate structure of communications or a new, formal procedure for the mutually satisfactory resolution of problems in the organization.

Now, I think I've already adequately alluded to the potential benefit, advantages or utilities which can flow from collective bargaining in either industry or schools; legitimate and in some instances necessary power may be acquired by the employee organization to wield in a hopefully responsible fashion for a wide variety of purposes, the rules embodied in the collective agreement can provide equal and uniform treatment of all, and the impartial adjudication of grievances can afford protection from arbitrariness and discrimination. When attempting to assess the appropriateness of bargaining to education, however, we must at least recognize and be aware of the disadvantages and disutilities which can accompany collective bargaining.

First, it is important to note that the establishment of a formal collective employee-employer relationship sets in motion certain processes in most situations which tend to convert the basic underlying assumptions concerning conflict and consensus on conflict into self-confirming hypotheses. For instance, once the bargaining relationship has been established, the employee organization as a political entity and its leadership may develop a vested interest in seeking out and maintaining conflict situations. Similarly, for instance, the dynamics of the collective employee-employer relationship may demand that a superintendent who has traditionally been on the teachers' side in the battle for higher salaries in his district may of necessity become, for purposes of giving the union a function at the bargaining table, and I quote, a "pluperfect s-o-b," as one superintendent of a large district has stated is the case with him. Formal collective bargaining in a school system may come to have many aspects which some persons, depending on perspective and context, might consider inappropriate disadvantages. In this vein, it will be asked whether, in establishing collective negotiations in schools, it is necessary or desirable to:

1. Assume and then put into practice an important and meaningful cleavage between, on the one hand, all of the rank and file professional teaching staff in a school and, on the other hand, all of those in managerial or supervisory positions, or,

2. Impose the comprehensive, mandatory and universally applicable set of rules which constitutes the well-developed collective bargaining contract on to the relationships in a school system with the effect of reducing or destroying what may be, in some instances, a desirable degree of flexibility--the ability to deal with uniqueness, and administrative discretion generally, or,

3. Establish an employee organization which can become a political entity with its own imperatives for existence and survival which may in some instances be separate from the interests of the rank and file which constitute its membership, and the majority of which at any given moment may impose policies through bargaining which submerge or ignore proper interests of minority groups, or,

4. Run the risk of a gross imbalance in the power relationships between various constituencies in a community with the consequent, inevitable misallocation of the educational resources of that community, or

5. Embrace a process which can put a premium on disingenuousness and power with a resultant distortion of rationality, which should be the heart of education.

The best that can be said at this point is, I believe, that there is little hard evidence on the question of whether collective bargaining or formal professional negotiations are either inevitable or desirable on a widespread basis in American education. We do not yet know the extent to which the assumptions concerning employer-employee conflict which underlie our structure of private sector labor relations are true of or appropriate to our public education system. We do not yet have sufficient analyses of specific collective negotiation relationships between boards and teacher groups which weigh both the utilities and dis-utilities which must inhere in every such relationship, to guide us in making a judgment as to what the impact will be of collective bargaining, and all it implies, on the school system conceived as an institution of client-centered professionals offering services to a public constituency. Rigorous research is simply not as yet available to indicate whether the type and degree of conflict to be found in any school system needs or deserves institutionalization through the establishment of a formal collective employee-employer relationship.

Now, a review of practices, procedures, and concepts of private sector bargaining is beyond the scope of this presentation. I would like to note, though, that providing any significant number of the key elements of collective bargaining such as machinery for determination of bargaining units and majority representative, exclusive representative status, union shop, dues checkoff, right to bargain and sign an enforceable agreement, grievance procedures, binding arbitration, the strike, etc., to an employee organization supports and encourages the bargaining relationship, constitutes an effective grant of power to that organization to wield in the collective relationship, and results in the institutionalization of the conflict presumed to exist by the assumptions we have mentioned which underlie the concept of bargaining.

Extension of any or all of these key elements of private sector collective bargaining to teachers or other public employees may be made by state legislation, municipal ordinance, or voluntary adoption (depending, of course, on the local legal picture), by a board of education or other public employing agency.

But, it should be noted that it was not until the adoption of the Wagner Act that management and labor in large sectors of our economy came to face each other across the bargaining table as two opposed collectivities in a relationship marked by a rough "equality of bargaining power" between the parties, and if experience in the private sector of our economy can be taken as any guide, it may be considered doubtful that formal, mature collective bargaining relationships will become dominant in public education in the U. S. until or unless the procedures and concepts which support meaningful collective employee-employer relationships are made generally available to teachers, most probably by state level legislation.

Now, again, while a review of legislative trends across the country is also beyond the scope of this address, I want to note that the discernible trend seems to be in many states to make an increasing number of the key elements available by court decision or statute to public employees, or to at least grant sanction and legitimacy to many of the procedures and practices of bargaining in the event that a public employing agency should see fit to embrace them voluntarily and encourage its employees to enjoy their fruits. There is considerable pressure in many state legislatures at this time for the passage of laws which will extend full collective bargaining rights, with the exception of the right to strike, to all public employees in the jurisdiction of the state.

Such legislation has indeed been passed in Wisconsin and, very recently, in Michigan. In addition, a number of state education associations have drafted legislation which favors a separate policy regarding negotiation rights for education. These "professional negotiation bills" would exclude teachers from coverage under laws providing bargaining rights for other employees in the public sector. Of 14 such bills introduced into state legislatures during the past year, 3 have become law. I would like to conclude with some more or less random observations on the AFT vs. the NEA, or, if you like, professional negotiations vs. collective bargaining.

My own personal opinion is that the reluctance of the NEA on the national and state policy levels to embrace immediately and whole heartedly the conceptual and procedural machinery of collective bargaining springs from

1. a desire to avoid emulating the ideology and practices of blue collar union-type bargaining as manifested by the AFT, and

2. a deep-seated intellectual or philosophic ambivalence and uncertainty regarding the basic assumptions of conflict and power in school systems which forms, in essence, both the theoretical and practical underprinning for collective bargaining.

The union accepts as a given the existence of significant conflict in school systems, declares the need of teachers for power to wield in that conflict, and sees collective bargaining on the industrial model as the appropriate means for gaining the power and handling the conflict. The NEA is not so sure about the inevitable inherency, nature and depth of the conflict, is somewhat uncomfortable using the idea of power and opposed interests to discuss the relationship of one segment of the educational fraternity vis-a-vis another group within the profession, and is instinctively wary, I think, of collective bargaining as a suitable method for structuring the leader-led relationship within a school system. Despite important differences between the two organizations, however, and granting that New York is somewhat unique, it is at this point rather difficult to distinguish very different patterns of activities of the affiliates of the two organizations as far as organizing strategies and tactics and negotiating or bargaining activity on the local level is concerned.

The significant differences between the approach and outlook of the organizations and manifested in such still real and important issues as:

1. affiliation with organized labor,
2. the inclusion or exclusion of administrators in the local bargaining organization.
3. the question of the applicability of traditional private sector labor law

procedures and practices to the educational context. The AFT, of course, stands for formal collective bargaining, with all its trappings, along the industrial model, while NEA or affiliates are beginning to show willingness to support legislation which might accomplish much the same end, but with different procedures prevailing and different personnel in charge, and

4. the question of the sanction vs. the strike.

The Future of Negotiations

Teacher-school board negotiating relationships are at present a heterogeneous phenomenon. Clear patterns have not yet evolved. Existing relationships are constantly changing, developing--maturing, if you will.

If current trends continue, collective bargaining will expand in public education. The alternatives are not clear. New forces may arise which will redirect the thrust of teacher unrest, but it is extremely doubtful that there will ever be a return to "normalcy." Whether an alternative to collective negotiations as a means for teacher influence in the policy formulation and administrative decision process will appear is an open question. Whatever such a form might be, it will have to make allowances for organized teacher power at the local level.

I might just mention, too, as I draw to a close, what I think is a question which is going to receive increasing attention in the years which lie ahead: that of the implications of the tendency to push disputes toward the state level and what may be the consequent changes in the structure of decision-making for the entire educational enterprise, at least with respect to questions of finance and control by the teaching profession over certification and entry generally into the teaching ranks. Here, of course, to date the experience of Utah is unique and clues to what the future holds in this regard should be studied in some detail.

However, even with an expansion in the role of the state and national governments in education, there will always be a wealth of issues which are of interest to teachers and which remain to be settled at the local level. As long as school boards have the power to allocate funds within the system and to establish rules and policies which affect the work of teachers, local collective action may be attractive to teachers, just as local issues remain important to collective bargaining in the auto industry.

Now, on the chance that much of this may have been quite heavy and perhaps over-theoretical, I feel that I have an obligation to end with some very practical advice. The AFT, particularly with its recent success in Philadelphia, and its vigorous behavior in New York, etc., seems at the moment to be able to take good care of itself, so the advice I have to give will be directed to NEA affiliates and to boards of education. If either or both boards of education and/or NEA affiliates wish to provide themselves with complete protection for their positions in resisting what may appear to them in some localities to be the onslaught of the union, they might consider adoption of a clause which appears in the school board's policy relative to negotiations in a school district in Ohio. The clause, which I commend to your attention, reads as follows: "The AFT or other unionization will be welcome in the district only if it is approved by the County Teachers Association or the local board of education."

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH OUTCOMES OF THE SEMINAR

As set forth in the introductory chapter, a major purpose of the Seminar was to develop new approaches to research in school administration in large city systems and to call attention to administrative problems deemed worthy of investigation by the participants. This objective was pursued in the development of three separate but related activities.

First, each of the formal papers presented by the participants was followed by questions and discussion from the floor. The focus of these discussions was upon clarifying issues raised in the papers and relating them to the experiences of the administrators in attendance. The product of these discussions was the identification of several researchable questions in each of the topical areas considered by the presenters.

The second activity directed specifically to research outcomes of the conference was the scheduling of small discussion group sessions during the week. Participants were assigned to either of two groups. Each group consisted of approximately ten members and contained both school and university personnel. These groups directed their attention to defining the character of research which could be most helpful to public school personnel and advanced a number of proposals which the participants would like to see carried out. Perhaps the most encouraging result of the conference was the fact that, at its conclusion, many of the participants expressed their intentions to continue in the development of some of these proposed research projects.

The third conference activity was designed to order and coordinate the research outcomes of the meetings. Dr. David L. Clark participated in the general activities of the conference and served as a resource person to the small discussion groups. Dr. Clark,who is a professor of education at Ohio State University and a former director of the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States

Office of Education, was of particular assistance to the discussants in bridging the gap between research as discussed in theoretical terms and the development of research activities in particular school systems.

Mention of this gap serves as an introduction to an important discussion topic of the Seminar alluded to in Chapter I, namely, the desparate orientations to research held by school and university representatives. Differences in perspective as to the nature of research were apparent early in the week and served as a basis for considerable discussion in which both school system and university personnel sought to develop more workable research relationships with each other. The nature of these differences and proposals offered as the basis for developing research projects and perspectives which can be helpful to both students and practitioners of educational affairs are summarized in the following pages. The need for school systems and universities to develop closer working relationships on research endeavors was emphasized continuously.

The remainder of this chapter consists of three sections. The first section presents without comment a series of questions for research which emerged from the formal presentations and succeeding general session discussions. No attempt was made to pursue the development of these questions during the conference. It should be noted also that the questions are illustrative of those raised rather than an exhaustive list of all possibilities. Section two summarizes the small group discussions and includes precis of the proposals made by participants for research which emerged from the ideas presented in the general sessions that were developed further in the small groups. The third section consists of the address of Dr. Clark which concluded the Seminar.

QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH EMANATING FROM SEMINAR PAPERS

David W. Minar, "The Politics of Education in Large Cities: A Political Scientist's Viewpoint."

1. Given the growing separation of social and geographical communities and

the apparent tendency of the school system to provide a linkage between the same in suburban areas, investigate the extent of this tendency in urban areas of varying socio-economic composition.

2. What is the linkage between city school board members, the public at large, and other city political systems? Does this linkage vary from that which is present in suburban and small town areas?
3. How do the political competencies (in terms of conflict management) of big city school board members vary from those of actors in other political systems? Combining this question with the one raised above (#2) may inform us as to whether the present difficulties of big city school boards result primarily from inadequacies of structure or personnel incompetencies.
4. What is the balance between the use of "local" and "cosmopolitan" information sources in dealing with internal and external school problems? For example, do school decision-makers place greater reliance upon "cosmopolitan" sources of information in reference to questions of school program or school-community relations?
5. Can the decision-making behavior of large city school board members be predicted according to variations in personal characteristics, means of appointment to the board, and/or structural characteristics of the school system?

Harold Webb, "Educational Problems and Politics in the Large Cities of America: Board Members Perspectives."

1. Do members of elected and appointed school boards differ in (1) their perceptions of the responsibility of the office, (2) the nature of their attachments to the community at large, (3) background and aspirations?
2. What implications does the changing role of American school boards have for the traditional concept of democratic, local control of education?

H. Thomas James, "The Politics of Educational Finance and Budgetary Decision-Making in Large City School Systems"

1. Conduct historical or longitudinal case studies which detail limitations on school board decision-making by various other agencies. Attempt to distinguish *de facto* from *de jure* school board powers.
2. Conduct cross sectional studies which determine the consistency of impact of a particular agency (e.g. unions, rural-dominated legislatures, accrediting associations, taxpayers groups, civil rights organizations, or curriculum study groups) upon school board decision-making latitude.
3. To what extent are school business managers oriented to local political norms as contrasted with superintendents' national professional norms? What effect, if any, does this difference have upon school systems?
4. What have been the effects of shifting much of the decision-making role in urban school systems from lay boards of education to second and third echelon administrators?
5. To what extent does the present structure of educational decision-making in large city systems assist or impede educational innovations in such systems?
6. What effect, if any, does the bureaucratic routine and discipline inherent in the large city systems have upon the professional orientations of staff members who labor therein?

Carroll F. Johnson, "A Superintendent Views the Racial Problems Confronting School Administrators."

1. What community guidelines can be used by "realistic" school administrators as indices of community receptiveness to further integration of the schools?
2. What techniques or strategies can be used by school administrators to encourage a more realistic viewpoint toward school integration on the part of "immobilists," idealists" and "men of vague goodwill?"
3. Can a common framework for viewing school integration experiences in various communities be developed? Can such a framework produce generalizations which would assist those seeking to integrate schools in still other areas?

4. Do the interests and activities of militant Civil Rights groups comprise a threat, a challenge, or aid to school boards and administrators seeking to promote integration? What beneficial working relationships can schools develop with these groups?

Charles E. Stewart, "Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators."

1. Undertake broad scale survey research to determine the expectations which various minority groups hold for the school and the representatives of the school. Follow this with a developmental program which orients school personnel to these expectations. Then attempt to determine whether such personnel are able to use this new knowledge in building meaningful school-community relationships.
2. Study in systematic large-scale designs the effects of integrated schools upon the attitudes of Negro and white parents as well as the attitudes and achievement of their children. The underlying question is the effectiveness of integrated schooling as a short term socializing mechanism.
3. Employ historical techniques including interviews and document analysis in an attempt to determine underlying factors or causative elements for outbreaks of racial violence or similar manifestations of strong protest against school policies.
4. Are Negro teachers and administrators more effective than their white counterparts in schools which have predominantly Negro student bodies?
5. What factors determine the reputation of an urban school system among the clientele of a particular area? Is it possible for central office pronouncements and applications (e.g. initiation of limited transfer programs) to compensate for perceived (real or imagined) shortcomings on the local level?
6. Are the characteristics required for effective school leadership in disadvantaged areas any different from those associated with success in other school settings?

Samuel Shepard, Jr., "School-Community Relationships in Large Cities."

1. Accepting the importance of parental attitudes toward the schools in influencing the educational success of children, what factors condition parental indifference and negativism toward the schools? Which of these can be changed by action of school personnel?
2. If we grant the validity of Shepard's thesis that home-school involvement contributes significantly to the success of the educational program, what areas of school endeavor are best suited for such cooperative effort? What are the most effective strategies that school personnel can adopt in promoting such involvement?
3. Are the techniques which have apparently been so successful in the Banneker district likely to produce similar results if replicated in other disadvantaged areas?
4. Does cooperation with other social agencies and federal anti-poverty programs hold promise for schools that wish to build stronger ties with the community they serve?
5. Is parent-school involvement the *sine qua non* for successful educational programs or is the significant relationship that between parent and child? If the latter is the case, can agencies other than the school build this relationship thereby allowing schools to channel their resources in other directions?

Arthur H. Rice, "The Inevitable Change in School Public Relations."

1. Do school districts with established public relations divisions or those with superintendents who possess special training in public relations experience less difficulty in acquiring resources than those without such a staff?
2. Are there public relations techniques or mechanisms that have such widespread success and general application that they should be included in the preparation of school administrators?

3. Under what conditions can a public school administrator afford to publicly admit his mistakes without jeopardizing his career and/or future support for programs in his districts? Does the fact that the schools are supported by public funds obviate the willingness of administrators to admit to an occasional "Edsel" thereby ensuring that every "experiment" is a success before it is implemented?

B. J. Chandler, "The Reorganization of Large City School Districts: Implications of Decentralization for Administrators."

1. Is district size the crucial factor in determining the frequency of interaction between school officials and their clientele? More importantly, is district size the major variable in determining the amount of direction and control which the clientele exercises over the system? If size is of such importance, what district size provides the optimum balance between functional efficiency and non-professional control?
2. What administrative adaptations would enable city school districts organized on the "system-unit" basis to escape the Scylla of program homogeneity forced by centralized fiscal collection and allocation and the Charybdis of inferior programs in poorer areas brought on by decentralized access to the public fisc?
3. What would be the effects on the overall school system of "functional decentralization" in which local administrators were given both authority and responsibility?
4. Would decentralization ease the myriad of pressures now brought to bear upon city superintendents or would it simply expose a larger number of "system"unit" administrators to the same pressures? More fundamentally, what is the present balance of environmental focus and structural limitations in determining the pressures attendant to the large city superintendency?
5. What would be the effect of decentralization upon the dissolution or

establishment of one-class or one-race neighborhoods?

6. Would "functional decentralization" ease the administrative problems created by conflicting pressures of organizational maintenance and professional ideology within large city school systems?

George E. Watson, "Large City-State Education Department Relationships: Problems and Prospects."

1. How will state departments of education allocate the vast sums available to them through recent federal legislation? What measureable effect will these increased funds have upon state educational programs?
2. What roles do the various state educational departments play in the formulation of state legislation dealing with education? Is there pattern to the variation in these roles (i.e. do variables such as size of the department, amount of money appropriated for education, methods of choosing the state superintendent, etc., have predictive power)?
3. What are the obstacles to a stronger partnership between big city school systems and state departments of education?
4. In the emerging new dimension of state department leadership in education, what kinds of specialists will be required to fill departmental positions? How can people who meet the demands of such positions be attracted and trained?

Luvern L. Cunningham, "The Preparation of Large City School Administrators."

1. There would appear to be need for studies which utilize pre and post test techniques to compare the effects of varying administrator preparation programs upon students' administrative perceptions and behaviors. The use of simulated situations (e.g. the recent study by Griffiths, Hemphill, and Fredericksen) would provide common evaluative criteria.
2. While studies of the type suggested above would be helpful in measuring the effect of various programs, they would not suffice to measure their relevance and effectiveness in actual administrative settings. Hence there

is a need for longitudinal studies designed to evaluate the career effectiveness of graduates from differing programs. Such studies could differ in measures of effectiveness and consider a wide range of independent variables. For example, a study which would have current significance would evaluate the importance of prior experience in disadvantaged neighborhoods upon the success of principals assigned to schools in such areas.

3. Given the current stress placed upon "moving up the ladder" as the route to top administrative positions in large cities, it would be interesting to study longitudinally the effect of prolonged tenure in subordinate positions upon initiative, open-mindedness, breadth of understanding, willingness to act independently and like variables. Stated briefly, the question is whether or not prolonged experience in lower echelons of a large city system constitutes favorable training procedures for upper level administrators.
4. What are the similarities and differences in the nature of problems which confront inner-city and suburban administrators?
5. What are the factors which distinguish large city school systems from other large organizations, and what importance do these factors have for the training of administrators?
6. Can the administrator's capacity to harmonize such often conflicting goals as school objectives and teacher needs become more artful through training?

Richard C. McVey, "Personnel Problems Confronting Large City School Administrators."

1. The findings of the recent Gross and Heniott study of principals would suggest the desirability of determining the relationship which exists among varying types of teacher preparation programs and effectiveness in the classroom. Several independent variables offer potential for analysis; among them are the extent of study in a teaching field, the extent of study in professional education courses, duration and format of practice teaching programs, and state certification requirements.

2. There is need to study the informal organizations and status systems of employees in large city systems. Such investigation would provide information about teacher motivations, incentives, and behavior patterns which would aid administrators in understanding why the rational plans of the formal organization sometimes go awry.
3. What effective criteria for the recruitment and selection of urban teachers and principals can be established? Is it possible to recognize desirable candidates at a sufficiently early date to enable teacher education programs to be adapted to their particular needs, interests, and abilities?
4. What is the relationship between the "psychodynamics" of teacher satisfaction: and the rise of militant teacher organizations?

Wesley A. Wildman, "Teacher Collective Action in the U. S.: 1965."

1. What effect does teacher militancy have upon the instructional programs of schools in which it is present?
2. Can teacher militancy be related to socio-economic characteristics of the teaching staff or the employing district?
3. Can teacher militancy be related to the size of the district, administrative patterns or styles which prevail in the system?
4. Is the assumption of continuing conflict which underscores private sector bargaining realistic for public education? If so, what are the potential effects upon the school system? If not, what limits can be placed upon bargainers without undermining the basic bargaining structure?
5. What factors provide the best explanation for the recent increase in teacher militancy? Do these same factors afford clues as to the long range inevitability and desirability of increased bargaining activity?
6. What strategies are available to school boards confronted by militant teacher organizations? What areethe likely consequences of these alternative strategies?

GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND RESEARCH PROPOSALS OF PARTICIPANTS

The discussion groups met five times for periods varying in length from forty-five minutes to one hour and forty-five minutes. These groups initially spent some time in the consideration of procedural questions and the definition of their roles and responsibilities. While the question of role definition was not fully resolved in early sessions, its introduction, as well as its recurrence in later sessions, crystallized a significant difference in the professional perspectives of participants. Stated in general terms this difference was characterized by a greater searching for operational solutions to recognizable problems on the part of participating administrators, and a contrasting preference by university people for systematic inquiry into the workings of schools systems with the goal of producing meaningful generalizations. To introduce the summarizing terms used in the discussions, the administrators were primarily interested in research directed toward "intervention" in the existing system--a "fix it" approach--and the university people were predisposed toward "inquiry" or an "explain it" approach. The dominating theme of discussions in the groups centered upon a search for a merger of these two positions. Early discussions addressed themselves to the question in broad context, while later sessions sought elucidation and clarification of specific researchable topics.

Following the Minar presentation, the groups considered the applicability of political science research as a tool for school decision-makers. Bringing forth such topics as school board elections, citizens' committees, and the community role of school principals, the question was asked if political scientists had been able to evaluate the decision-making processes and potential of each. Two limitations upon research in these areas were noted. First there is a dearth of comparative studies due to limitations (at least thus far) of manpower and resources. Second, the point was made that we must be wary of seeking research-based mechanistic answers which prescribe solutions to problems. Since all situations vary in some respects, it is impossible to generalize with certainty from past research to a particular situation.

Turning the issue somewhat, it was asked if there is a method of incorporating the aspect of research into the internal resolution of school problems. Such a development would fulfill a "quality control" function within a particular school system. Focusing upon the use of research techniques and processes, a research department would provide the necessary investigative and evaluative services for the on-going school program. Hopefully, school systems would be freer from external constraints and pressures in the evaluative process, and they would certainly be spared the expense and inconvenience of employing outside agencies to affirm decisions already made within the system. While no one disputed the need for such internal research, it was pointed out that a great deal of what we must know about school systems is comparative. Thus it was argued that professional educators cannot afford to focus exclusively upon internal research.

The second meeting of the small discussion groups produced a list of problem areas in which the participating administrators thought research could be helpful. Those areas are outlined as follows:

1. The Relationship of Student Achievement and School Integration

This raises the old question of homogeneous vs. heterogeneous grouping, but forces redefinition of these terms--that is, the researcher or the administrator must begin with a definition of integration and evaluate integration patterns as grouping patterns. The related question of what constitutes student achievement is also a major one. It was pointed out that if one were to focus on the terms that the Supreme Court has employed to discuss integration, evaluation would have to be in terms of student self-image. Grades, behavior patterns, attitudes and students' associations might all be dependent variables worthy of investigation.

2. Research on Bilingual Problems and Development

Related to the integration question, and perhaps even more pressing in the schools of the Southwest, is the problem of teaching non-English-speaking children effectively. It was suggested that studies in this area would be of great help to

Southern school districts and other cities which have large concentrations of non-English-speaking ethnic groups.

3. The Area of School Board Effectiveness

Noting that several of the conference speakers envision change in the role of school boards, perhaps with an accompanying decline in their importance, the participants asked what could be done to help boards become more effective. It was their feeling that research should be directed toward defining the functions of board members, their political competencies, and the relative press of internal (within the school system) and external forces upon them.

4. The Problem of Necessary Training for School Administrators in Large Cities

Participants were of the opinion that the demands upon and functions of large city school administrators differ from those of their rural and suburban counterparts. When pressed to clarify these differences, however, they found it difficult to do so. It was therefore suggested that research be directed toward establishing the nature of these differences, and subsequently developing effective educational programs for preparing administrators to cope with them.

5. The Union and Bargaining Issue

It was the general feeling of the participants that increased teacher militancy and pressures for bargaining agreements will cause a change in the nature of the school program and the role of the administrator. It was urged that research be directed toward pointing out these differences and their effects upon students, teachers and subordinate administrators as well as superintendents and board members.

6. School Staffing Patterns

The participants noted that today's administrators continue to use yesterday's staffing patterns to meet current educational demands. Assuming the tasks and problems confronting the schools have changed in the past several decades, the participants asked if staffing requirements to meet these problems might not also have changed. While they expressed no desire for replication of the countless number of teacher-pupil ratio studies, they would like to see research directed toward defining staffing requirements in terms of teachers and supportive services necessary to meet the demands of education in a complex society, and more specifically, the unique needs of increasing numbers of urban youth.

7. The Question of Teacher Recruitment

Closely related to the problem of determining overall staff needs is that of determining teacher needs far enough in advance to design attractive and effective training programs. Large city systems, in particular, are in need of accurate means of estimating the number of teachers required to replace retiring or transferring members, as well as those needed to compensate for changes in enrollment patterns.

8. Attracting and Retaining Competent Teachers in Inner-City Schools

The problem is an obvious one to big city school administrators who continually see new teachers assigned to slum schools rush to put their names on the transfer list. While limited success in retaining teachers in such areas has been experienced in a few situations (such as the "More Effective Schools Programs" described by Dr. Gross), systematic research is needed to point up steps which districts can take to assure retention of competent teachers in such areas.

While the participants hastened to point out that the above list of problems is by no means all encompassing, it certainly represents a major share of those which they find most perplexing. They were also quick to admit that in most of these situations they, themselves, are not sure of the most effective research strategies to confront the issues and lack the time to address the questions on anything more than an *ad hoc*, "fix it" basis. These disclaimers, however, do not minimize their interest in seeing these problems attacked by those who have the competencies and resources necessary to deal with them.

The third small discussion group sessions departed from the consideration of researchable areas to return to questions dealing with Seminar strategy, research classification and the relationship between school and university people.

As mentioned earlier, questions of this sort were raised throughout the Seminar and provided the basis for much meaningful dialogue between school and university personnel. A major outcome of these discussions was a greater appreciation by both school and university personnel for the interests of the other and a resulting determination on the part of both to seek common ground and closer communication in the future.

The strategy questions were threefold. In the first place it was asked whether the Seminar participants should draw a line between urban school administration and urban instruction, urban curriculum, etc. After considerable discussion in which the consensus seemed to be that administration is a generic term encompassing all of these other areas and thus hard to delimit operationally, it was agreed that some arbitrary bounds should be established for the Seminar. The suggestion was made and accepted that future deliberations should focus upon researchable problems growing out of administrative issues such as the ones raised by Dr. Gross in his keynote address. The second strategy question asked whether participants could spend their remaining time more profitably by continuing to raise particular problem areas such as those mentioned above, or by devoting their attention to more specific consideration of sub-topics within these areas. The decision was made to push ahead with the development of more specific proposals. Finally, a third strategy question dealt with the scope of proposals to be considered. Here it was suggested and affirmed that the efforts of a Research Seminar of limited duration could be best directed to projects which lend themselves to relatively uncomplicated designs and fairly modest commitments of time and resources. The rationale behind this decision emphasized the need for quick payoffs that could provide stepping stones to more sophisticated research efforts in the future.

By this time the difference in research orientation of school and university participants had become apparent to all. What was needed, they felt, was a way of developing a bridge between these interests. Hence, some time was given to the development of a classification scheme for research proposals. The classification agreed upon was a two-dimensional typology. The first dimension, drawn from the work of Talcott Parsons, signifies those levels within the school organization with which the research deals. There are three such levels: technical, managerial, and institutional. Within school systems, the technical level is best represented by the student-teacher relationship; the managerial level is characterized by group maintenance activities of the school bureaucracy; and the institutional level is characterized by the external dealings of the school system which primarily involve the superintendent and the Board of Education. The second dimension summarizes the orientation and direction of the research proposal. Here again three categories are proposed: research, research and development, and development. Those proposals in the research category are directed primarily toward inquiry and the understanding of existing situations including causes and results. Development proposals are directed toward the initiation of action to mitigate or eliminate a recognized educational problem. The middle category, that of research and development, combines the two approaches to discover new information and implement it in problem solutions. This typology is reproduced below.

	Technical	Managerial	Institutional
Research			
Research and Development			
Development			

Considering the proposals and concerns that had been put forth thus far by Seminar participants, it was noted that the school people preferred technical problems and developmental approaches. University people, while expressing interest in a variety of problems, tended to emphasize research proposals. The key question then was how to marry the two sets of concerns--or to put it another way, what would be the most effective relationship that could be established between public school people and university personnel? While no final answer to this question was forthcoming, the possibilities of two future developments in particular captured the interest of all who were present. First, there was much enthusiasm for the idea that the universities should help school districts to devise some kind of internal mechanism which could be used to conduct inquiry which has both utility for school systems and interest to other researchers. An example of a possible development of this type would be the introduction of small research teams within the school system for periods of short duration. Such people would be trained researchers who would come into the system and work for it, investigating, reporting on, and helping to solve problems which were posed for them by school personnel but using techniques which have widespread acceptance in outside research circles. These people would leave the system after a period of one to three years and be replaced by another research team. Both schools and scholars would profit from such cooperative arrangements.

The second consideration which drew a favorable response was the proposal that university personnel reexamine their unstated policy of appealing only to other academics, and consider instead their obligations to assist in local school decision-making processes. Too often educational researchers write only for the consumption of other educational researchers and their graduate students. The result is often an emphasis on technique or methodology and a corresponding neglect of substance. The participants agreed that university personnel should probably pay greater attention to the day-to-day problems confronted by the public schools, and should be skeptical of applying classical research techniques to these problems. Thus it was suggested that a greater willingness on the part of school personnel to accept university researchers, combined with a shift in the attention of university personnel to operational school problems would provide the basis for more meaningful relationships between school and university.

The remaining time allotted for discussion in the small groups was devoted to the consideration of potential research problems and designs which were advanced by individual participants and of particular interest to them. The following paragraphs sketch these proposals in terms of the problems with which they deal, their objectives and suggested procedures. They also incorporate the reactions and modifications offered by other members of the group. To repeat, these proposals are only illustrative of the types of research endeavors which would be helpful to urban school administrators in their quest for answers to a host of complex problems.

1. The Evaluation of In-Service Training Programs for Inner-City School Teachers

Problem: Many large city school systems are faced with the necessity of orienting newly-employed teachers to the cultural realities and educational problems found in "inner-city" schools which enroll large numbers of disadvantaged children.

Objective: The proposal purports to determine the effectiveness of in-service training programs in bringing about attitudinal and behavioral pattern changes in newly-appointed teachers.

Procedures: Select matching groups of newly-appointed teachers who have been assigned to schools with large numbers of disadvantaged children. Introduce the teachers in the experimental group to an organized in-service program developed around the concepts of: (a) the characteristics and needs of disadvantaged children; (b) the learning environment of the classroom; (c) relationships between school and community. At the end of the school year, compare the teachers in the experimental and control groups on the basis of their attitudes toward disadvantaged children and the job of teaching them, supervisory evaluation of their teaching, and the achievement of children in their classes.

2. Determination of Optimum Level of Supportive Services to be Afforded Classroom Teachers

Problem: There is an observable trend toward increasing services to schools and their pupil population through the provision of additional staff personnel. These supportive services encompass specialists such as reading clinicians; speech therapists; psychologists; counselors; subject matter specialists in Art, Music, Physical Education, etc.; and non-certified teacher aides. The question which must ultimately be raised and dealt with in terms of student achievement and optimum allocation of school resources is whether a point of saturation can be identified beyond which additional personnel do not contribute to improved academic achievement.

Objectives: The project would reexamine the concept of self-contained classrooms in the light of changes in instructional practices and school organization patterns. It would also seek to measure the effect of increasing residential school staff services, with a view toward identifying the point beyond which additional staff has little or no effect on the improvement of academic achievement.

Procedures: Members of the group were in agreement that this project would necessitate a large-scale cross-sectional and longitudinal study. It was further agreed that considerable planning would be required to determine the variables which should be evaluated and to identify or develop the necessary instruments for collecting pertinent data. Thus a logical next step in pursuing this proposal would be the establishment of a planning team which would work on project development. The participants were very interested in the establishment of such a team to follow through with this project, and felt that it would be particularly worthwhile to measure the effect of introducing non-professional personnel into the school systems.

3. New Staff Requirement Projections

Problem: The determination of future staff needs affects the recruitment and retention of teachers as well as teacher education planning. A major source of such needs is the replacement of teachers leaving the classroom.

Objective: The study would strive to provide year-by-year estimates of needs for new staff within a system by grade level and subject matter.

Procedure: Take a stratified sample from personnel records of teachers serving during calendar years and leaving during those years. Encode all available information. Identify factors related to the probability of leaving during one year, such as teacher characteristics and subjects taught. Test all variables in combinations existing within the collected data. Repeat the process for other years to determine accuracy and reliability. The group noted that it would be valuable if such predictions could be made five years in advance. Such a procedure would then enable personnel in teacher training institutions to recruit students from their freshman classes with an eye toward placing them in jobs upon graduation. It was also noted that a study similar to this is currently in progress in Buffalo and may possibly serve as a pilot for a more extensive undertaking.

4. The Importance of Integration to Quality Education

Problem: Current social pressures augmented by pronouncements of leading scholars suggest that only an integrated school can be a good school. While there is some opposition (academic and otherwise) to this assertion, there is little data to justify a firm stance on either side of the question.

Objectives: This study would purport to determine the effect of the amount or lack of integration upon pupil achievement. It would also seek to evaluate the effect of integration upon the attitudes of those comprising the school community.

Procedures: The group pointed out that prior to undertaking such research, one would have to consider the moral question of the desirability of integration. To some, the study would be irrelevant. However, if this question of desirability could be put aside, the project would remain one of major dimensions. It would require longitudinal applications over a large number of schools in varying socio-economic settings. It would also require the establishment and use of accurate instrumentation. Throughout the study it would be necessary to focus upon the problems and results of integrated programs, rather than searching for specific data which could be used to buttress a particular argument or point-of-view.

5. Administrator-Teacher Organization Relations

Problem: The increased militancy of teachers has placed school administrators in the center of a power struggle which seems to make the role of the administrator more complex and at the same time increasingly nebulous. The administrator is placed in a position where he must search for new and tenable relationships with the groups with which he deals.

Objectives: This research would focus upon lower-echelon administrators (e.g. principals) in an attempt to determine how collective bargaining affects their role, what new competencies such administrators should possess, and potential guidelines for dealing with bargaining groups while maintaining effective school programs.

Procedure: It was suggested that the study would be conducted on a comparative basis by examining in detail the roles and activities of administrators in districts where teacher unions did and did not exist. Data on administrator role definitions and responsibilities would be sought from teachers and administrators in each type of district. Inferential statistical techniques could then be employed to test emerging generalizations.

6. Community Action Programs and Educational Decision-Making

Problem: Community Action Programs, established by Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, provide for the funding of educational programs initiated by or submitted through local coordinating councils. These councils, by virtue of their power of review and/or initiation, possess potential for educational decision-making. The national interest requires that this potential be exercised in a fashion consistent with sound educational theory and practice.

Objectives: This proposal would investigate the relationship between school decision-makers and local coordinating councils to determine which parties exercise leadership in the making of educational decisions and the bases upon which decisions affecting educational programs are made. The research would further seek information as to how the role of the superintendent of schools might be changed through his dealings with community council personnel. Underlying socio-economic variables as well as differences in political structure would be investigated as possible causative factors for schoolboard-superintendent-council relationships.

Procedures: Research would be conducted by studying a limited number of community action programs which vary in size, composition, community political structure and underlying socio-economic structure. Data would be gathered by interviewing school superintendents, school board members and members of the community action council.

7. The Effectiveness of Non-School Educational Programs

Problem: Recent federal legislation has led to the establishment of educational programs, external to public school districts, which have caused some concern about eventual duplication of programs based on different sources of financing. A particular example of this is the Headstart Program which is being conducted by many social and welfare agencies as well as school districts. In view of the laudable goals of

Headstart and the varied nature of the operating agencies, it is important to ascertain if all sponsoring units are performing successfully.

Objectives: This project would attempt to determine unit efficiency by comparing the success of programs conducted through school districts and those sponsored by other agencies.

Procedures: Pre-tests and follow-up tests to determine both achievement and school readiness would be administered to students in both types of programs. Appropriate statistical procedures would then be utilized to compare the program success of various sponsoring agencies.

8. An Experiment in the Reorientation of Educational Leadership to the Changes of the 1960's

Problem: School board members and school administrators, while discharging their on-going responsibilities, experience some difficulty in recognizing and orienting themselves to significant educational changes. This difficulty stems from their need to maintain the on-going program, their restricted opportunities in receiving information concerning developments external to their system, the relatively narrow focus of their separate professional organizations and a lack of experience in generalizing from their particular situations.

Objectives: This proposal would seek to improve the instructional program by effecting a broader, more common understanding of changes and a wider knowledge of means to facilitate change. It would also test the effectiveness of one device for disseminating new knowledge and practice to persons operating the schools.

Procedures: "Revivalist" teams of outside school innovators and educational researchers would be sent on a tour of the large cities to awaken, enlighten and challenge the local educational leadership, both lay and professional, in a modern-day revival or Chataqua. The week of presentations would be preceded by the distribution of questionnaires to participants eliciting their reactions to the topics planned for discussion. Similar questionnaires would be distributed after the meetings at intervals of one month, one year and three years, and changes in attitudes would be noted.

9. A Demonstration Project for the Identification, Selection, Preparation, In-Service Development, and Support of School Administrators for Disadvantaged Communities

Problem: The problem of administering schools in disadvantaged communities is somewhat unique and substantially difficult. Consequently there is need for more administrators (primarily principals) capable of providing effective leadership for these schools.

Objectives: This project would seek to develop better understanding of the problems, skills, competencies, etc., indigenous to the administration of schools in disadvantaged communities and to recruit, select, and prepare persons competent for leadership in such areas. Training would include appropriate on-campus and field experiences such as pre-service internships. The project would also provide continuing in-service education and back-up services for program graduates who assumed positions in disadvantaged communities.

Procedures: The development of this project would require several phases. The first would include extensive study of required administrator behavior in disadvantaged areas. This research would serve as a baseline for determining curriculum content and establishing criteria for the identification and selection of trainees. A talent search would be conducted for candidates who would be enrolled in a pilot preparation program. The next step would be the establishment of in-service and back-up programs. Finally, the entire program would be evaluated and revised as deemed necessary.

10. The Development of a Model for the Evaluation of Compensatory Education Programs

Problem: Recent legislation has stimulated the implementation of many educational programs to meet the needs of the poor. Various factors have limited the development of comprehensive evaluation components to supplement these programs. Furthermore, the nature of the programs is such that conventional assessment techniques are often inappropriate to their demands At the same time it is clear that in planning future programs, administrators will need to make decisions based upon the apparent success or failure of present programs.

Objectives: The initial effort of this project would be directed to the analysis of the stated objectives and evaluation components of present programs. Working from this analysis, an attempt would be made to develop a two-dimensional model which would provide the practitioner with a taxonomy of educational objectives and appropriate evaluation designs to be utilized in determining the effectiveness of programs for the children of poverty.

Procedures: There was widespread agreement among the participants that this is a worthy project which demands immediate development. It was also agreed that it could be conducted best on an intercity basis. Consequently it was suggested that, as a first step, an intercity planning team be formed for the purpose of preparing a prospectus to obtain a planning grant to prepare for the cooperative involvement of university and city personnel on a broad scale basis.

11. An Analysis of State Strictures Upon Urban Educational Decision-making

Problem: During the period from 1957 to the present it has appeared that the several state legislatures have enacted measures which have tended to restrict the decision-making latitude of school officials in the major city school systems of this country. It now appears that reapportionmen may alter the balance of power in these legislatures. Urban education would be aided in planning for the future by clarifying expectations of changes in school legislation which might accompany reapportionment.

Objectives: This study would first specify state legislation which restricts the options of urban school officials. The legislative history of each measure so classified would be traced in an attempt to determine: (1) the reasons for its passage and (2) the likelihood of its redress in the event of reapportionment.

Procedures: The research would be conducted by reviewing school codes to identify legislation enacted for cities of the first class and the extent of comparable legislation for remaining districts. City board of education members, chief state school officers, and key state legislators would then be interviewed to determine reasons for enactment and the likelihood of change in the event of reapportionment.

12. A Preliminary Inquiry as to the Selection and Use of Multi-level Textbooks

Problem: The use of textbooks on different reading levels is usually done to meet differences in reading ability among students. The means of selecting these texts and their use varies considerably among the large cities. Comparative information regarding present practice could provide useful guidelines to those responsible for recommending textbooks for adoption.

Objectives: The project would endeavor to provide information on current practices in the adoption and use of multi-level textbooks in the large cities. It would also attempt to discover ways in which the use of multi-level texts may contribute to the improvement of reading.

Procedures: Inquiry would be directed to the large cities to find out (1) the subject areas and grade levels in which multi-level texts are adopted, (2) the means by which such texts are selected, and (3) the planned relationship between instruction in subject fields with multi-level texts and the overall reading improvement program. Data obtained from this preliminary inquiry would fulfill the first objective. This data could then be used to identify student groups to be tested on an intercity basis in an effort to determine the relationship between various multi-text programs and reading improvement.

13. Development of a Metropolitan Approach to Eliminating De Facto Segregation

Problem: Many large city school systems have pupil populations which are 50 percent or more Negro in composition with the prospects of increasing to 70 per cent or more within the near future. Articulate spokesmen in these same cities reject as inadequate compensatory programs, increased expenditures for equipment, and lower staffing ratios in inner city schools and demand instead that inner city Negro school populations be integrated with the school population of surrounding areas. The question raised is: Will the present structure of city, county, state relationships and administrative patterns allow for solution of *de facto* school segregation problems, or is a broader, more highly centralized state structure necessary?

Objectives: This project would seek to define the problem on a statewide level and to describe it in meaningful terms to lay and professional personnel at this level. It would further seek to establish on an experimental basis this metropolitan approach to the *de facto* segregation problem and to assess the results of such an approach.

Procedures: The participants were somewhat apprehensive of the broad scope of the proposed project and the many factors which could arise to impede both its developmental and evaluative phases. It was agreed that the action phase of the project would require comprehensive citizen involvement and extensive public information activities in order to gain backing for the enabling legislation which would be required.

More important, such activities would be necessary to insure parental cooperation. The evaluative phase would be made difficult by various pressures which would be difficult to control in any comparative analysis. Nonetheless, the project was deemed to be of critical importance and its initiation was urged even if all potential evaluative schemes would be somewhat "unclean."

14. An Analysis of School-University Communications Procedures

Problem: The general lack of communication between school administrators and university professors (both of education and other subjects) is widely acknowledged by members of both groups. Yet intuitive judgment would suggest that both groups could profit from regularized contact and cooperation with the other.

Objectives: This project would attempt to identify the nature and frequency of contact with university personnel of a selected group of school administrators. It would further seek relationships between administrators maintaining such contacts and various measures of administrative success.

Procedures: The nature and frequency of school-university contacts would be determined through personal interviews with school superintendents and university professors. Administrative success would be measured in terms of school board member perceptions and superintendent performance in simulated administrative situations.

In concluding this summary it is fitting to reiterate the desire for action research which was expressed by participating school people. The above proposals are representative of problems which concern school people in the day-to-day maintenance and operation of educational programs. It is hoped that researchers will orient themselves to these and similar problems with the goal of providing information that can be meaningfully applied by school decision-makers.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS OF THE SEMINAR: A REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS

David L. Clark
Professor of Education
Ohio State University

The most forceful impression left with me after five days of speeches and deliberations is the impact of change--revolutionary change--on education in the great cities today. Unfortunately, it has become so fashionable in education to begin every presentation with a reference to the impact of social forces on change in education that many of us have become immune to the real changes which are taking place. But try, for a moment, to imagine what a conference of this sort might have been considering five or ten years ago. Would there have been serious discussion of the substantial diminution of the power and authority of local boards of education? Would anyone have attended, except perhaps on an academic basis, to the possible emergence of a federal system of education either coordinated with or parallel to local and state systems of education? Who would have risen in the meeting to describe a total plan for school integration in a city the size of White Plains, New York? Would the educators present at such a conference have accepted as "givens" teacher organizations as the bargaining agents for collective negotiation in local school systems, or inter-agency organizations such as the Physical Science Study Committee as the primary force for curriculum change in America's public schools?

The fact that we can accept these as rhetorical questions is truly amazing. The sanctity of the local board of education, the Office of Education as a social bookkeeper, the state education agency as a mild depressant to school change, the professional organization as a friendly gathering place for after-school gripe sessions (which included the administrators), the neighborhood school as the most significant organizing concept for local school systems were truisms in the training programs for educational administrators in the early 1950's.

But there has been an ever more immediate alteration in the American educational system which places these changes in a different perspective--the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I was reminded of this by contrasting the current Research Seminar with the Research Seminar on Teacher Education in the Great Cities which was held just two years ago. The big question at that time was not what it was we wanted to do but how we could conceivably get money to do the job, assuming that we knew what we wanted to do. That question has just never been raised at this session. The assumption is being made for the first time by educationists that the money is now available and the problem is the identification of ideas and innovative patterns of response to our troubles. ESEA has placed us in this position and now forces us to begin to make hard choices of strategy in responding to change and effecting needed changes.

This last point, choices of strategy in effecting needed changes, is the one I would like to focus on in discussing the research implications of this Seminar. Through the Seminar papers and the proposals developed by the participants we have received a reasonably comprehensive catalog of substantive areas for research and I will refer to them only in illustrative terms. The question remains, however, what can and should be done to bring research and development to bear on the current scene in urban education. My own background of experience and the discussions of the past five days suggest three strategies which seem important to me:

1. Institutionalizing research and development programs in urban school districts.
2. Sloughing off trivial R and D projects and identifying and concentrating on the significant and crucial problems confronting urban education.
3. Instituting inter-city and city-university R and D projects to make the most effective use of the resources available to tackle the problems.

Institutionalizing R and D Programs

Research and development needs to be translated into the life blood of the public school enterprise in the same fashion in which this translation has occurred in the military and in business and industry. R and D is not something extra to be undertaken after the primary job of educating the children and running the school is finished. This is easier said than done as even our experience of the past few days indicates. To a substantial extent, we have treated our own research and development ideas here at this meeting as frosting on the cake--something that would be nice to do but that is not a part of the basic fabric of the school system itself.

You may recall that one suggestion offered at this meeting was the employment of a proposal writer in local school districts so that the district could take full advantage of the ESEA. This is a technique which has already been adopted by many colleges and universities and, depending upon the job definition and the man in the job, has worked with varying degrees of success. I would not contend that the idea has no merit but I am going to use it illustratively in a negative sense. The notion sustains the conception of research and development as something off to the side, something separate, something, as a matter of fact, which interferes with the on-going activities of the regularly employed staff.

This is simply not good enough. We are never going to have research and development accepted at the public school level until it is defined in terms of the administrative purposes and functions of the school system. R and D has to be defined in relation to the school system in the same way that we now have reasonably clear definitions of the tasks of the assistant superintendent of business affairs or the assistant superintendent for instruction. In these cases, we can see the integral nature and necessity of the position and the office in terms of keeping the school system going. Can you say as much for your director of research or assistant superintendent for research? If you were forced to give up one major administrative post in your school system would you dispense with your school business official or your director of research? The answer would be clear in most school systems because efficient and effective business operations are necessary for survival. R and D has been considered as something which is not necessary to survival but simply to improvement, and we must survive but need not improve.

The magnitude and social urgency of the problems in urban education indicate that this day has passed us by--that to survive we must improve. And the route to improvement is through a vigorous and well-conceived research and development program. I would like to suggest four basic administrative purposes which can be served by R and D in an urban school system and which should, I feel, form a set of general guidelines for institutionalizing such a program. I will not talk about the form of organization which could or should be used to carry out these purposes, but ask you instead to simply consider the purposes themselves. They are.

1. Developing solutions to operating problems, i.e., engineering.
2. Maintaining an up-to-date picture of the school system as a social system, i.e., social bookkeeping.
3. Stimulating change and innovation in the system, i.e., research dissemination and action research.
4. Assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the system, i.e., quality control.

Some of my colleagues, perhaps you, would add a fifth function relating to the development of new knowledge about education. I hesitate to do this for two reasons. In the first place, I am not at all certain that such a function can be justified as a responsibility of local school districts. Secondly, it seems to me that placing a priority value on such a function is likely to perpetuate the divorcement of the researcher and the practitioner in local school settings. Now to temper this position a bit, I will concede that from time-to-time a local district may have need for new knowledge about education to support its more particular R and D efforts and may mount ad hoc basic and applied research efforts which look very much like university-type research. As long as such a venture is entered because the district has need for the knowledge and not because it is a status activity, I would concede its legitimacy. In this case, the district is in effect saying, "We're not going to wait fifteen years to see if somebody somewhere in this country is interested in the problem. We're going to tackle it ourselves because we need the information now."

Engineering. I think that there are very few public school systems that have built into their own administrative mechanisms a method for devising operating solutions to practical problems with which the school system is faced--invention and design teams, if you will. Among the proposals developed by this conference group we have illustrations of this type of problem. One person proposed a study of the effective use of multi-level texts in improving reading. This is an operating problem which an R and D team could tackle directly employing the internal resources of the district and whatever external resources are needed. Another individual offered another example in a proposal to develop guidelines for dealing with emerging teacher organizations.

Individuals working on this facet of the district's R and D program could be viewed as the engineering component of the local school system. They face "bread and butter" problems in a creative way attempting to invent and design solutions appropriate to the particular local situation. Their reward comes from the solution to the problem not in writing articles for professional journals or seeking esteem from a national professional peer group. This, in practical terms, is what I mean by spelling out R and D as an administrative function within the school system.

Social Bookkeeping. This is not meant to be a term of derision, as it is so often used by "scholars," but a descriptive term which indicates that local schools have a social obligation to maintain records on their staff and students not only for their own administrative purposes but for state and federal educational planning. Many districts already serve this purpose through their research divisions and the group discussions provided us with a good example of how this function can be extended and improved. You will recall that a project proposal suggested building a model for estimating staff needs on a continuing basis. In final form such a model could be used in one or several of the large city school systems. This type of activity would be a new dimension for most social bookkeeping systems in school districts, that is, conceptualizing new ways of treating the data with which the social bookkeeper is confronted in his day-to-day operation in the system. Having done this, he can supply new information, not just demanded information, to the superintendent, the board of education, and to other components of the system itself.

Research Dissemination and Action Research. One proposal suggested the use of research dissemination in the stimulation of innovation and change in schools. We do have available a considerable body of information which, if brought to the attention of educators in local districts, could broaden their options and choices in developing and electing curricular programs and practices. One of the most effective dissemination techniques which has been discussed here this week is the demonstration conducted in the naturalistic setting of the school itself. The proposed administrative leadership project is illustrative of a pattern of school and university cooperation in the stimulation of innovation which would fall within this category.

Another aspect of the use of R and D activities to stimulate innovation can be designated as "action research." Only one speaker referred to the term action research in the past week and in doing this he fumbled and said, "That's not a nice word in scholarly circles." I am not talking about sloppy research or inept research or whatever has come to be associated with the term action research over the past decade. I am talking about the employment of research-like activities to stimulate innovation on the part of school district staff which was, as I understand it, the original definition of the term as used by Professor Stephen M. Corey of Teachers College, Columbia University when he introduced it into the literature of education. His notion was that replications of the experiments which were being conducted around the country could be made in local school systems with the dual advantages of (1) involving and interesting teachers and administrators in educational innovations and (2) verifying the generalizability of the original findings. I am convinced that this is still a powerful and effective idea which has been discarded because of abuses attached to the idea. A forward looking R and D program would pick this notion up and build upon it as another way of integrating R and D into the system.

Quality Control. David Minar, in his presentation, referred to this facet of school district research as "policy consequences research." This is to say that the system itself must be sensitive to the consequences of the changes and alterations going on within the system. The R and D program must be able to assess the impact of these alterations on the attainment of objectives or redefinition of objectives in the system. This requires gathering different data than those noted under the heading "Social Bookkeeping" which is the closest most local school systems have ever come to quality control programs.

Carroll Johnson offered us an illustration of the utility of a continuing program of quality control when he discussed the difficulties of mounting a special project to evaluate the changes within the system which were caused by the White Plains integration plan. The necessity to mount a special evaluation project (which fell through) and the doubtful information which could be gathered through the regular district testing program is typical of most school systems at the present time. We are not geared up to maintaining a quality control research program which gathers sufficient data, particularly process data as contrasted with product data, so that when there is an alteration in the system we can relate the alteration to the ongoing process and product measures which we have for the system as a whole.

Summary. I have probably already belabored too long the single point that we must redefine and institutionalize research and development so that it becomes an integral part of the administrative operation of local school systems. If this is done, many other things will fall in line. R and D will not have to fight for its life to survive in the administrative hierarchy and obtain budget. It will create an environment for change in the system. We can stop worrying about projects as such because the very system will produce projects--and projects which touch on the real problems of the school district. In short, for the first time R and D will pay its own way.

Identifying Crucial Problems

I reviewed again last night the fourteen projects which were developed here this week and wondered, as I was reviewing them, how the problems proposed for attack might stack up against the major problems now being faced by the schools in the great cities of this country. I had the feeling that if you had three weeks instead of three hours to think about this, and if you had been thinking about it chiefly in relation to your own system, the nature of some of the problems and projects might have changed quite markedly. As a matter of fact, I compared the projects with the substance of the discussions which followed the presentations and discovered that few of the projects talked about the same problems which seemed to be the most burning issues in the discussion periods. This may be another evidence of the fact that since research has not assisted materially in solving our problems in the past, we do not expect that it will in the future, and we save ourselves embarrassment by addressing our attention to more modest efforts which may be successful.

There is a "hooker" in this proposition, however, which I mentioned in my introduction. Money is now available to engage seriously in research and development activities and most of the large school systems in this country are going to be knee deep in such efforts. It was usually safe in the past for any of us to list any type or amount of research we felt was needed because nobody was going to do it anyway. But now that we are actually going to be engaged in conducting R and D programs we must somehow sort out the trivia and focus on the major substantive problems.

I tried last night to come up with some "quick and dirty" criteria for sorting out the trivial from the significant problems and, at least for discussion purposes, I will list them for your consideration.

1. Strength of the intellectual dimensions of the proposal.

   Is there some kind of logical framework or theoretical structure undergirding the project? Does it have the possibility of heuristic value beyond the conduct of the individual project itself? Does it fit into a flow of on-going research? Does it allow us to think about our problems in a different way than we have been able to think about them before?

2. Breadth of impact of the proposal on the school system.

   The fact that an R and D project is likely to be significant to only one small group within the organization does not mean that you will not go ahead with it, but I think it is one of the criteria to use in assigning priorities for action.

3. Effectiveness and efficiency.

   What impact is it likely to have in relation to the demands placed on the resources of the system?

4. Sustaining nature of the idea.

   Does the innovation appear to be an idea which will have long tenure? This obviously is a guess, but I think we can make some reasonably educated guesses in terms of the staying power of some ideas in contrast with others which seem to be fads.

5. Interrelated consequences of the proposal.

   Is it possible to itemize the negative as well as the projected positive consequences which an innovation may have upon the system? If so, a more reasonable assessment of priority can be made.

These are obviously half-formed ideas about criteria for R and D projects and I am less interested in debating them than I am in provoking you to improve upon them. Certainly they are not stated in operational form but even in their present crude state I think they can be applied to some projects. Apply, for example, the first criterion to two suggestions for research which arose from the presentations. The first suggested using the concept of "fluctuating centers of power" in the great cities to study implications for school district reorganization in urban centers. The second suggested initiating more extensive and intensive research on the public relations function as it is carried out in great city school districts. On the face of it, there seems no comparison to me in the intellectual dimensions of these two proposals. We must develop a "sense of idea" which allows us to sort out the trivial problems and begin to concentrate on some of the major problems, and some set of criteria are needed to assist in this task.

Instituting Inter-Agency Projects

From PSSC through the Office of Education's Regional Educational Laboratories, this is the day of the inter-agency compact to effect educational change, and the utility of such a strategy was well illustrated by the project proposed by a participant. You will recall the suggestion that many of the R and D projects which will be initiated during the next five years will have (1) common objectives, (2) common or similar names, but that (3) the procedures used in carrying out the projects, i.e., the actual substance of the programs themselves, will be quite different. If natural processes are allowed to take their course, the evaluation instruments and procedures will also be different and no inter-city comparisons would be possible. On the other hand, if there were common objectives, differential procedures, and a common pattern of evaluation, a considerable amount of comparative data could be gathered across and between systems. The proposal therefore, was pressing for an inter-city development project to devise instruments and designs for evaluation which could be used to this end.

Obviously such a project could not be undertaken by a single system and, as a matter of fact, could probably not be mounted without tapping the resources of evaluation experts in colleges and universities. Yet it would have high payoff not only for the great cities but for many school districts across the country. I think this idea can be extended to include a school and university study team working for the next several years to attack not only the question of common evaluation instruments for projects within the great cities, but the whole question of new designs for conducting and evaluating field projects in school systems.

Your project proposals and the speaker's presentations, beginning with Minar's call for more comparative research, emphasized the necessity for inter-city R and D programs. You are fortunate in already having a vehicle available through the Research Council of the Great Cities Project and you should take advantage of it. But the availability of the Council should not make us lose sight of the necessity for city-university projects. This relationship has not always been a fruitful one in the past and there are certainly conflicting institutional goals which impede easy cooperation. Just as I discussed earlier the need for institutionalizing R and D in city schools systems, I could now insist that professional schools and colleges of education will have to institutionalize the function of effecting change in schools if they hope to play a significant role in educational development. Too often, colleges and universities have felt that if they had a small field service bureau, they were fulfilling their obligations in this respect. This level of commitment will not do the job.

The greatest urgency for school-university cooperation lies, I feel, not in the realm of traditional research but in some of the types of development and demonstration projects suggested at this meeting. It may be significant that these cooperative ventures were suggested by personnel from institutions of higher education. If this represents disillusionment with past efforts on the part of public school personnel it is understandable but intolerable. We need to mobilize our meager resources in a variety of inter-agency compacts to face the monumental job ahead.

Summary

Quickly, I wish to review the three recommendations of this presentation:

1. R and D can be justified as a basic administrative function for local

school districts. Ultimate justification will come when it pays its own way.

2. In this period of time when we are faced with monumental and challenging problems, we must find a way to focus our attention on the crucial areas of concern in mounting R and D programs.
3. Inter-agency compacts and arrangements will be imperative if we are to use our resources effectively in mounting programs of educational change.

APPENDIX A

SEMINAR PROGRAM

Sunday, August 1, 1965

7:30 P.M. Welcome - B. J. Chandler, Dean, School of Education, Northwestern University.

Structure and Goals of the Seminar - Michael D. Usdan, Director of the Seminar

7:45 P.M. "Urgent Issues in the Big Cities: Implications for Administration" - Calvin E. Gross, Dean, School of Education, University of Missouri at Kansas City

8:30 P.M. Implications of Keynote Address for the Seminar

Monday, August 2, 1965

9:00 A.M. "The Politics of Education in Large Cities: A Political Scientist's Viewpoint" - David Minar, Associate Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University

Discussion and Reactions.

10:15 A.M. "Educational Problems in the Large Cities of America: Board Members Perspectives" - Harold Webb, Executive Director, National School Boards Association.

Discussion and Reactions.

11:15 A.M. Work Groups - Research Implications

1:30 P.M. "The Politics of Educational Finance and Budgetary Decision-Making in Large City School Systems" - H. Thomas James, Professor of Education, Stanford University.

Discussion and Reactions.

3:00 P.M. "A Superintendent Views the Racial Problems Confronting School Administrators" - Carroll F. Johnson, Chairman, A.A.S.A. Special Committee on School Racial Policy and Superintendent of Schools, White Plains, New York.

Discussion and Reactions.

4:15 P.M. Work Groups - Research Implications.

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

9:00 A.M. General Discussion of Research Implications.

10:00 A.M. "Racial Issues Confronting Large City School Administrators" - Charles E. Stewart, Director of Teacher Education, Detroit Public Schools.

1:30 P.M. Work Groups - Research Implications.

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

2:15 P.M.	"The School-Community Relationship in Big Cities" - Samuel Shepard, Jr., Assistant Superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools.
3:30 P.M.	"The Inevitable Change in School Public Relations" - Arthur H. Rice, Professor of Education, Indiana University and editorial advisor, The Nation's Schools.
4:30 P.M.	General Group Review.

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

9:00 A.M.	"The Reorganization of Large City School Districts - Implications of Decentralization for Administrators" B. J. Chandler, Dean of the School of Education, Northwestern University.
10:30 A.M.	"Large Cities--State Department Relationships: Problems and Prospects" - George E. Watson, former Wisconsin State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
11:30 A.M.	Work Groups - Research Problems.
1:30 P.M.	"The Preparation of Large City School Administrators" - Luvern L. Cunningham, Director, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
3:30 P.M.	Group Review
5:00 P.M.	Dinner and Social Evening, Northwestern University Campus, President's Dining Room, Sargent Hall.

Thursday, August 5, 1965

9:30 A.M.	"Personnel Problems Confronting Large City School Administrators" - Richard C. McVey, Professor of Education, Roosevelt University, formerly Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Chicago Public Schools.
10:30 A.M.	Discussant, Harry N. Rivlin, Dean of Teacher Education, City University of New York.
11:00 A.M.	Work Groups - Research Problems.
1:30 P.M.	"Teacher Collective Action in the U.S.: 1965" - Wesley A. Wildman, Director, Labor-Management Projects, Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago.
4:00 P.M.	Review of Group Research Proposals.

Friday, August 6, 1965

9:00 A.M.	Final sharpening of Group Research Proposals.
10:00 A.M.	Presentation of Group Research Proposals.
11:00 A.M.	"Research Implications of the Seminar: A Review and Synthesis" - David L. Clark, Professor of Education, Ohio State University.
12:00	Adjournment of the Seminar.